UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHER EVALUATION PROCESSES

by

SANDRA B. WOITAS ©

A THESIS
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
AND RESEARCH IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF EDUCATION
IN
EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL POLICY STUDIES

EDMONTON, ALBERTA
FALL, 1996

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-612-18226-6

Canada

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR: SANDRA B. WOITAS

TITLE OF THESIS: PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHER EVALUATION PROCESSES

DEGREE: MASTER OF EDUCATION

YEAR THIS THESIS GRANTED: 1996

Permission is hereby granted to THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA LIBRARY to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

S B Woitas

(Student's signature)

Permanent address:

9544 - 100 Street
Edmonton, Alberta

Date: Oct 1/96

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHER EVALUATION PROCESSES submitted by SANDRA B. WOITAS in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of MASTER OF EDUCATION IN EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION.

....
(Supervisor) Dr. José da Costa

....
Dr. Dave Sande

Ken Ward
....
Dr. Ken Ward

Date: September 20, 1996

ABSTRACT

The primary purpose of this study was to investigate the processes used by elementary school principals to evaluate the performance of certified teachers. A secondary purpose was to investigate how the summative evaluation processes were perceived by teachers and administration.

Data were collected in two ways: (a) interviews, and (b) a review of relevant information. The review of the documents included the board policy, and if available, the individual school's performance appraisal plan. These documents provided a basis for discussion and confirmation of information shared during the interview process. A naturalistic method was used to analyze the data collected from the semi-structured taped interviews conducted with the five principals and five teachers.

The findings of the study indicated that the principals and teachers perceived the passing of the district policy as being positive. A shared general perception suggested that the policy facilitated consistency and increased accountability for both stakeholders.

Fifteen recommendations regarding further study and the practice of implementation of evaluation policy are offered as concluding comments.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study could not have been conducted without the guidance, support, and cooperation of several people. I wish to acknowledge Dr. José da Costa for his invaluable assistance, constructive advice, and outstanding encouragement. This was all enveloped within a wide margin of patience. Dr. da Costa is a true teacher.

Appreciation is also conveyed to other faculty members. My heartfelt thanks and appreciation go to Dr. Dave Sande and Dr. Ken Ward. Both gentlemen have not lost sight that children are our most valuable resource and that, as educators, we must work collectively to do what's best for all children in classrooms.

Gratitude is also expressed to Cathy Holman for her word processing expertise. Most important, I value her friendship.

Appreciation is conveyed to the teachers and administrators for their cooperation in participating in the research. Their voice gave the study its purpose.

Finally, a sincere thank you to my husband Tom and my two sisters Phyllis and Lois. Their patience and constant encouragement throughout this study will forever be treasured. It is to them that this thesis is dedicated with love.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Chapter

1. Introduction and Statement of the Problem 1
    Purpose of the Research 4
    Research Problem 6
    Definition of Terms 6
        Processes 6
        Elementary 6
        Large urban district 6
        Evaluate 7
        Performance 7
        Certified 7
    Significance of the Research 7
    Organization of the Thesis 9
2. Review of the Literature 10
    Teacher Evaluation in Alberta 10
    Teacher Evaluation: Alberta Context and Beyond . 16
        Relationship between principal and teacher . 24
        Development of collaborative cultures 25
        Continuous review of policy 28
    Alternative Methods of Assessment 29
        Teaching portfolio 29
        Peer supervision 32
    Summary 35

3. Method 37

Sampling 37

Table 3.1
Composition of sample 39

Juba Elementary School 40

Table 3.2
Ethnic origin report as of 1991 41

Table 3.3
Highest level of education achieved by respondents (1991) 42

Indigo Elementary School 43

Table 3.4
Household income of respondents (1991) . . . 44

Heartland Elementary School 45

Table 3.5
Residency status of respondents (1993) . . . 46

Oak Ridge Elementary School 47

Keepsake Elementary School 49

Ethical Considerations 50

Data Collection 51

Validity of the Research 52

Data analysis 53

Delimitations 53

Limitations 54

Summary 54

4. Findings 55

How the Evaluation Was Conducted at the School Site 55

District policy for evaluation 55

General perceptions 59

Principal preparation for the process 62

Who was involved? 65

Juba Elementary School 66

  Strengths and Weaknesses 69

    Strengths 69

    Weaknesses 71

Heartland Elementary School 74

  Strengths and Weaknesses 77

    Strengths 77

    Weaknesses 79

Indigo, Oak Ridge and Keepsake Elementary Schools . 81

  Strengths and Weaknesses 85

    Strengths 85

    Weaknesses 89

What Influenced the Criteria Used in the Summative Process 94

  District Policy 95

  Programming Considerations 96

  Parent Involvement 102

Effect of Evaluation on Principal and Teacher Relationships 106

  Principal and Teacher Relationship 106

Building Trust 112

Value of Summative Evaluation 116

  Confirmation of teacher skills 116

Supplementary Approaches to Summative Evaluation . 118

Summary 120

5. Discussion 122

  How the Evaluation Was Conducted at the School Site 122

  Strengths and Weaknesses 126

What Influenced the Criteria Used in the Summative Process 128

District policy 128

Programming considerations 130

Parent involvement 133

Effect of Evaluation on Principal and Teacher Relationship 138

Value of Summative Evaluation 140

6. Conclusions, Recommendations, and Personal Reflections 143

Conclusions 143

How the Evaluation Was Conducted at the School Site 143

General perceptions 143

Principal preparation for the process . . . 144

Who was involved 144

Strengths and weaknesses 145

What influenced the criteria used in the summative process? 146

Effect of Evaluation on Principal and Teacher Relationships 147

Building trust 147

Value of Summative Evaluation 148

Supplementary Approaches to Summative Evaluation 148

Recommendations 149

Recommendations for Further Research 154

Personal Reflections 155

REFERENCES 156

APPENDIX A. Administrator Interview Schedule 169

APPENDIX B. Teacher Interview Schedule 173

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

3.1 Composition of sample 39

3.2 Ethnic origin report 41

3.3 Highest level of education by respondents . . 42

3.4 Household income of respondents 44

3.5 Residency status of respondents 46

CHAPTER 1

Introduction and Statement of the Problem

The evaluation of teachers has become a popular "platform" of elected officials to assure the electorate that students are receiving quality instruction. The renewed concern for the evaluation of teachers and the role of the principal, as important to the outcome and impact of teacher evaluation policies, are certainly reflected in the Alberta Education Three Year Business Plan (1994-1997). The purpose of the Business Plan is to provide directions to improve education for all students in Alberta.

An emphasis on accountability is interwoven throughout the business plan. According to the plan, measuring results and applying them toward improvement in student achievement and learning are fundamental to improving the performance of the education system at the provincial, school board, and individual school site.

Mireau, in the development of an in-service kit on Evaluating and Improving Teaching Performance, stated, "The evaluation of teaching is a complex activity fraught with emotional and political overtone, but it holds the potential for the challenge and growth of supervisors and teachers involved in the process" (1985, p. 1-1). The principal's supervision and monitoring of instruction is an integral part of meeting this challenge. Secondly, at the school level, the principal's participation in the evaluation of teaching is a critical component of increasing accountability. Most important, however, the teacher is the pivotal element in the classroom in terms of student achievement.

Locally, effective June 1, 1995, board policy adopted by a large urban district established: (a) "the board believes that an on-going process of planning and support for improved staff performance, including evaluation, is essential in achieving the mission of the district" (CODE: GBC.BP TOPIC: Staff Performance, 1995), (b) "the Superintendent of Schools shall be responsible for establishing a staff performance evaluation process, which shall include the requirement that a written evaluation be completed for every staff member at least once every three years" (CODE: GBC.BR TOPIC: Staff Performance, 1995), and (c) "all written evaluations shall be placed on the staff member's personnel file" (CODE: GBC.BR TOPIC: Staff Performance, 1995).

Policy analysis reveals that even mandated changes have not always been implemented in the way the policy makers may have suggested. One of the key factors which critically influences the process is the individual who must carry out the policy and its actions. De Roche

(1987) targeted the school principal as the influencing factor in the development of effective evaluation processes. Maynes, Knight, McIntosh, and Umpleby (1995) identified principals as the key players in designing meaningful, positive teacher evaluation practices. Sergiovanni (1995) contended that principals are the driving force in bringing about adoption and implementation goals. "They play key roles in planning and providing leadership for changes addressed to individuals and the school" (p. 287). While it has been acknowledged that principals are key participants in the implementation of policy process and are commonly referred to as "change agents" to facilitate the process, Fullan (1982) has also shown that not all principals are effective change agents.

Few issues in education are as controversial as teacher evaluation. The responsibility to supervise and evaluate teachers is not a new one for principals, but it is a responsibility that is the most difficult to perform. The principal must possess credibility and expertise as the evaluator. Enveloped within this also lies the principal's ability to manage the change process if the teacher evaluation policy is to meet its intended result. With each evaluation, the principal reaffirms the beliefs and values he or she attaches to teaching and learning. In addition, the principal must deliberate his or her capacity to function as an effective change agent. Finally, an analysis of the major stakeholders in the process and the context in which the teaching and learning take place must also be considered. Coupled with this are the writing and observation skills necessary to conduct the evaluation, inter-personal communication skills, and a sound knowledge of the legal responsibilities of both parties. The process is complex and the importance of the principal's role in the evaluation process cannot be underestimated.

Purpose of the Research

The purpose of the research was to investigate the processes used by elementary school principals in a large urban district to evaluate the performance of certified teachers and how these processes were perceived by the teachers and administrators.

The purposes for evaluation are generally divided into two major areas: evaluation for making personnel decisions (summative) and evaluation for professional development purposes (formative). Summative evaluation is concerned with "what was done." Formative evaluation is concerned with "doing" (Pearce-Burrows, 1994). For the purpose of this research, the emphasis was on the summative evaluation processes used by principals.

To guide the development of this study and the analysis of the data, specific questions were designed. The first cluster of questions focused on how the evaluation was conducted at the individual school site. This initial inquiry was posed in order to gain information about the district policy, the specific school based procedures used, and the strengths and weaknesses of the process.

The second bank of questions was designed to identify what influenced the criteria used in the summative process. It was in this context that whether or not the local socio-economic factors were part of the criteria that influenced the evaluation process at each individual school site was explored.

The effect that the process of evaluation had on the relationship between administrators and teachers constituted the third cluster. How the principals built trust and kept it with those staff members who were receiving summative evaluations was also investigated.

The final category of questions excluded the administrators. These questions were designed to explore certified teachers' view as to whether the results of the summative evaluation were valuable in adding to their repertoire of skills and to what extent.

Research Problem

The major research questions that this study was designed to address were: **"What processes are used by elementary school principals in a large urban district to evaluate the performance of certified teachers and how are these processes perceived by teachers and administrators?"**

Definition of Terms

Terms relevant to this study are defined in the manner in which they are used in this study.

1. Processes. "Processes" describes the actions which are required to carry out a summative evaluation and which operate within a specific set of guidelines.

2. Elementary. "Elementary" is a term to describe a school including kindergarten and the first six grades.

3. Large urban district. For the purpose of confidentiality, the term "large urban district" will be used rather than identifying the district. It is a district located in a large urban centre in western Canada.

4. Evaluate. "Evaluate" refers to the procedures used when judgements describing a teacher's performance are written and kept as a permanent record in the personnel file.

5. Performance. "Performance" describes the "carrying out" of those roles, responsibilities or duties that are outlined in a role and responsibility statement for the position held.

6. Certified. "Certified" is a term used to describe a staff member who has completed a probationary period with a school district and has been granted a permanent teaching certificate in the province of Alberta.

Significance of the Research

The implementation of the board policy has become a mandated change. One of the key factors which critically influences the process is the individual who must carry out the mandated change. In school site decision based settings, that is the administrator. Where meaningful positive teacher evaluation processes were identified, it was useful to study this practice as not only a proactive measure for the implementation of this policy, but for the implementation of "other" policy as well. We can learn from others' successes. In contrast, we can also gain valuable insight from the "lack of success" of others.

While it is acknowledged that there are unique differences among school cultures, the literature review did not identify local socio-economic factors as being important for the implementation of teacher evaluation policy. If the purpose of school based management is to provide "customized" service oriented toward the needs of the community, it would appear advantageous to promote "customized" matches to enable this transaction to positively occur. This study explored the importance of selecting personnel who can best meet the needs of the school community in its largest context.

The readings are full of examples of what has not worked in teacher evaluation. The general thread throughout the literature contends that processes which deal with teacher evaluation are usually "done to teachers rather than with teachers" (Ripley & Hart, 1989, p. 15). Teacher evaluation cannot be viewed as another "quick fix accountability scheme." Teacher evaluation, as a process to get teachers working together, to heighten ownership toward school goals, to increase accountability of all stakeholders and as a process to promote life long learning, is essential in meeting the purpose of the Alberta Education Three Year Business Plan (1994-1997) to improve education for all students in Alberta.

This study identified practices built upon collaboration and trust which best met the needs of the classroom teacher and the school itself, in its work toward continuous improvement. Improving teachers and schools are the keys to improving students. One cannot benefit without the other.

Organization of the Thesis

The first chapter has introduced the purpose of the study. Chapter 2 provides a review of the literature on teacher evaluation. Its focus is on summative evaluation practices. Chapter 3 describes the research method that was used to guide the inquiry. Chapter 4 provides a presentation of the findings. Chapter 5 discusses the findings in relation to the literature. Conclusions, recommendations, and personal reflections are presented in Chapter 6.

CHAPTER 2

Review of the Literature

As the focus of the study is on the formal or summative evaluation of teachers in a large urban district, studies which described supervision of teachers for professional development or formative purposes were largely ignored. Priority was given to research focusing on teacher evaluation for which personnel decisions were made. Specifically addressed in this review are the following topics: (a) teacher evaluation in Alberta, (b) teacher evaluation – Alberta context and beyond, (c) alternative methods of assessment, and (d) summary.

Teacher Evaluation in Alberta

Over the past 20 years in Alberta, the basic purposes of teacher evaluation practices have pivoted around two major themes: (a) improvement of instruction to increase student achievement, and (b) accountability.

In 1984, Alberta Education developed a policy on teacher evaluation which required school jurisdictions to formally develop and adopt their own practices to address teacher performance. A decade later emerged the Alberta Education's Three Year Business Plan (1994 - 1997). The purpose of the Business Plan was to provide direction to improve education for all students in Alberta. As the Business Plan stated, "The primary business of education is to ensure students learn the skills and knowledge they need to be self-reliant, caring and contributing citizens" (1994, p. 15).

An emphasis on accountability was woven throughout the plan. Accountability, as discussed in the document, refers to measuring results and applying them to improve student achievement and learning. It suggests that accountability involves improving the performances of the education system at the provincial, school board, and school levels.

The principal's supervision and monitoring of instruction at the school level is an integral and critical component of increasing accountability. Blended with this, of course, is teacher evaluation.

A considerable body of literature exists on the topic of teacher evaluation. The purposes for evaluation are generally divided into two major areas: evaluation for making personnel decisions (summative) and supervision for professional development purposes (formative).

Several studies have focused on teacher evaluation in Alberta. From 1977-1978 the first initial comprehensive view of formal teacher evaluation practices in Alberta was conducted by Reikie (1977). Formal evaluation was defined as a "written report, leading to a recommendation or a rating which is submitted to the central office of the school system" (p. 17). Of 115 superintendents invited, 114 participated in the study. Reikie's major findings were: (a) teachers new to the jurisdiction were most likely to be evaluated, (b) larger systems lacked formal evaluation policies, (c) superintendents and principals were the most involved, (d) superintendents were seeking increased principal involvement, (e) 29% of jurisdictions had standard evaluation forms, (f) the evaluation process was primarily driven by the requirement to make recommendations for permanent contracts and permanent certification, and (g) appeal procedures received minimal attention (Burger & Bumbarger, 1991).

In 1980, Alberta Education Planning and Research Branch conducted a study which revealed that 33% of Alberta school systems still had no formal procedures for the evaluation of certified teachers. Secondly, only 55% of those districts with formal evaluation policies adhered to the schedule.

In 1984 the Alberta Education Policy Manual identified teacher evaluation as essential for the provision of effective instruction to students and as essential to assist in the professional growth of teachers (Alberta Education, 1984, p. 72). Within this, eight purposes for teacher evaluation were described. These were to: (a) promote, achieve and maintain an acceptable quality of instruction; (b) improve the performance of teachers in securing desirable instructional outcomes; (c) provide information useful when considering placement of staff; (d) provide specific feedback concerning teacher performance; (e) provide professional assistance to teachers in the performance of teaching tasks; (f) provide a basis for planning inservice programs; (g) provide written evaluation reports on teachers in public and private schools for purposes of documentation, as required; and (h) assist teachers in professional growth and development (pp. 4-5). Rymhs, Allston, and Schultz (1993) divided these purposes into two categories: summative or formative. Four of the purposes "a," "b," "c," and "g" fit into the summative category. The remainder were formative in nature.

Duncan (1984) established that 4.5% of Alberta school district evaluation policies met the minimum criteria for due process. Duncan found further that only 1.3% of the school jurisdictions met the minimum criteria for improvement of instruction. Clearly, the eight purposes for teacher evaluation, both summative and formative, delineated in Alberta Education's Program Policy Manual were not being met.

At the same time of the Duncan investigation, Townsend (1984), in a study of teacher evaluation practices in five southern Alberta secondary schools, found several major weaknesses in their implementation of the evaluation policy. Weaknesses identified were: (a) unreasonable time demands for supervisors to meet the demands of the policies, (b) teacher rejection of evaluations done for administrative purposes, (c) decline of teacher confidence in the skills of evaluators, (d) information provided to teachers regarding the process was lacking, (e) teacher training regarding evaluation purposes and process was insufficient, (f) administrative leadership with respect to evaluation was weak, (g) inadequate district office support, and (h) lack of consideration for divergent models of teacher evaluation (pp. 20-31).

In 1986-1987 Burger and Bumbarger (1991) analyzed teacher evaluation policies from thirty randomly selected Alberta school jurisdictions and the results were compared to the key findings from the considerable body of literature that exists on the topic of teacher evaluation.

In the thirty policy documents reviewed, there was an emphasis on the summative aspects of teacher evaluation. The purpose of the policy documents existed primarily for personnel decision making and the meeting of bureaucratic requirements. Formative supervision was featured to a far lesser degree. Relatively little emphasis was placed on the professional development of teachers. Even less mention was paid to the linking of evaluation results to the needs of the district; the needs of the school were completely ignored.

In their interpretation of a 1986 survey conducted by the Alberta Teacher's Association, Keeler and Wall (1987) suggested that the provincial policy at that time on teacher evaluation only "encourages teacher involvement" and does not "mandate a mechanism" for this to occur" (p. 14). An improvement brought forward by those teachers who participated in the survey was the increased involvement of teachers throughout the process. Rymhs, Allston, and Schultz (1993) in the simplest of terms stated that "Common sense and a knowledge of organizational theory would strongly suggest that teachers should play a large part in helping to set the criteria by which the work is to be judged" (p. 196). One of the first recommendations Housego made in his 1989 study to enhance the quality of teacher evaluation repeats the importance of the policy having input from teachers, principals, and other officials. The input generated by these stakeholders would develop a core of criteria to be used in the evaluation of teachers. This lends itself to teacher involvement at either the district level or the school level (p. 214).

Teacher Evaluation: Alberta Context and Beyond

In the comprehensive study of teaching evaluation practices in 32 American school jurisdictions, Wise, Darling-Hammond, McLaughlin, and Bernstein (1985) identified those districts which had experienced successful implementation of evaluation policy as having four implementation factors common throughout. These were: (a) top-level leadership and institutional resources for the evaluation process, (b) evaluator expertise, (c) administrator-teacher collaboration to develop a common understanding of evaluation goals and processes, and (d) processes are compatible to the district's goals and organizational context (p. 78).

Townsend (1987) maintained that the heart of any effective evaluation policy was the collaborative relationship between the teacher and administrator where the input from both stakeholders drove the process (p. 28). This was further reinforced in the literature review on teacher evaluation conducted by Gellman and Berkowitz (1992) in their investigation of factors perceived as important in teacher evaluation. They cite the work of Strike and Millman (1983), Kauchak, Peterson, and Driscoll (1985) and Selmes (1986) on the importance of teacher input for successful evaluation procedures. Evaluation should be jointly negotiated and agreed upon by teachers and evaluators (Gellman & Berkowitz, 1992, p. 220). Lemmon's paper (1991) comparing three evaluation models concluded that "regardless of the evaluation process, there will inevitably be problems in having the evaluation reports adopted or used unless teachers are personally and professionally involved in the design, processes and outcomes of appraisal. Teachers must have some ownership in the process. Appraisal systems that do not fully involve teachers act against their best interests" (p. 38).

From the time of the initial comprehensive study conducted in 1977 to the present, not much has changed in the area of teacher evaluation in Alberta. This is illustrated in a (1993) report published by Alberta Education. "In general, the impact of the provincial policy on teacher evaluation has been positive, but the teacher evaluation process is only beginning to evolve from a discrete task to be done in order to comply with board and provincial policy to one that is an integral part of the leadership goals of the school and the system" (p. 121).

Teachers involved in the Alberta Education study (1993) generally related their experiences with their own evaluation processes as being fair. Despite this, however, also came agreement among respondents about difficulties encountered in teacher evaluation practices in Alberta. These difficulties, in turn, were categorized as: (a) relationships, the world of the classroom; (b) the purpose of the evaluation; (c) the evaluator as expert; and (d) school cultures for professional growth.

Difficulties which were suggested in the relationship category were built on a strong singular foundation; the importance of trust in the process. Where the teachers saw the principal in his or her role of evaluator as a retainer of power emerged an even more prevalent lack of trust. An indicator of one of the difficulties was found in the unannounced visits by the administrator to eliminate the possibility that the teacher purposefully put on "a show" for the evaluator.

The difficulties identified in the category titled world of the classroom included comments which were two-fold. Teachers felt that the number of classroom observations were too few and that the principal lacked adequate information on the skill relationships of the students, their interpersonal relationships with the teacher, and the students' levels of achievement to make a fair assessment. Principals, however, sometimes felt "set up" by the classroom observation. This is shown in the superficial execution of a lesson which was not part of the regular learning process; rather a carefully orchestrated show. Within this superficial relationship lies a subtle dishonesty where both parties, careful not to tamper with an already precarious relationship, do not get the issues "on the table" for discussion. Examples of this included teachers refusing to make comments on the evaluation reports and principals fearful that recommendations shared with the teacher for improvement may be discussed by the teacher with members of the community. The impact of this on the larger school community was perceived as potentially harmful. Therefore, the problem was simply not brought to the table for discussion. It was avoided.

Difficulties outlined in the category titled purpose of teacher evaluation included: (a) inconsistency of criteria, (b) differing expectations amongst evaluations, (c) teacher as a passive element in the process, (d) sameness of the policy (i.e. veteran teacher vs. beginning teacher), and (e) teachers resistant to the process.

Many teachers and principals, in the category of the evaluator as expert, spoke of the subjective nature of the evaluation process. In the simplest of terms, teachers would provide administrators with lessons they felt the administrators would want to see. Another concern voiced was the need for the evaluators to be knowledgeable and current in those subjects they observed. This furthered discontentment for many of those teachers in the areas of second languages and high school specialists.

Where school cultures were not built upon the premise of professional growth for all and where the evaluation process was an entity upon itself, outside of the day-to-day life of the teacher and students, was where the dissatisfaction emerged most strongly (Alberta Education, 1993, pp. 120-123).

Many of these Alberta based concerns were also enveloped in the comprehensive American study conducted eight years prior. Wise, Darling, Hammond, McLaughlin and Bernstein (1985) suggested the major themes throughout their study as to weaknesses of evaluation processes were: (a) teacher resistance or apathy, (b) evaluators lacking competence to evaluate accurately, (c) lack of consistency within a school system, (d) inadequate training for evaluators, and (e) the difficulty of the principal assessing the competence of a specialist teacher (pp. 75-76). Many parallels can be drawn between the two studies.

The literature on teacher evaluation suggests that the formal evaluation process seldom results in meaningful changes in teacher behavior. Secondly, seldom does the formal summative evaluation process change student learning. Enveloped within this, the formal summative evaluation process seldom results in a more professional relationship between the teacher and the school principal.

> Generally speaking, many teachers report that criteria for evaluating them range from unclear to unacceptable; other teachers who are more positive about the teacher evaluation process state that it serves more to confirm their status than to alter their teaching. Only a minority of teachers cite the evaluation process as a factor in any major or significant change in their teaching practices. (O'Reilly, 1995, p. 7).

Leithwood and Fullan (1984) cited a Canadian study in their examination of increasing school system effectiveness in which only 40% of teachers felt that their participation in the performance appraisal had "planted seeds for improvement." Less than 20% had felt that their participation produced no change at all. For a decade spanning from 1972-1982, Kuzsman and Horte

(1986) surveyed 8,600 teachers in 87 school districts in areas ranging from Newfoundland to Florida. Four percent of teachers felt that there was "considerable improvement" in their behaviors as a consequence of their involvement in an evaluation process. Seven percent indicated little improvement and 89% felt there was no improvement (p. 30).

However, where teachers did speak positively about the benefits of teacher evaluation and reported changes in their teaching behaviors was most often associated with situations where the process was closely embedded at the school site. Its foundation was secured on the importance of continuous growth for competent teachers. The principal was the key figure blending teacher professional development and teacher evaluation based upon individual and school improvement plans. This was reinforced in the 1995 study conducted by Maynes, Knight, McIntosh and Umpleby where exemplary teacher evaluation practices were investigated. The principals played key roles in designing meaningful positive teacher evaluation practices. The authors found the teacher evaluation process to be deeply embedded in the school's culture. It was a natural part of professional interdependence. Teachers felt control over the teacher evaluation practices in their schools. Housego (1989) contended that such a participative approach to evaluation enhances not only teacher rights but also their responsibilities.

Teachers in a 1986 survey conducted by Turner were asked to contribute their feelings based on their own evaluation experiences. The principal was perceived as playing a key role in effective evaluation practice. In the composition of what made a good evaluator, Turner narrowed the teachers' input as follows: (a) principal visible throughout the school, (b) took on the role of coach, (c) entire focus enveloped within fairness, (d) non-threatening approach in his or her identification of strengths and weakness, (e) the provision of additional skills and strategies to enhance teacher's professional growth, and (f) an understanding of the context in which teacher's performance is evaluated. Levin (1982) suggested that the process of evaluation is strongly dependent upon the expertise of the evaluator. One of the recommendations made by Wise et al. (1985) toward the establishment of evaluation practices producing information that districts could use for helping teachers improve or to make personnel decisions was that "the school district should regularly assess the quality of evaluation, including individual and collective evaluator competence" (p. 105).

Relationship between principal and teacher. A theme throughout the literature was the importance of trust between the principal and teacher in successful teacher evaluation practices. "The personal and professional relationships that each of the leaders had established with their teachers were important facets of this nurturing ... and common among them was their teachers liked and trusted them." (Maynes et al., 1995) In contrast, where teachers describe negative responses to the evaluation process, it is deeply embedded in the lack of trust. These were often in situations where power and control become part of a perceived hidden agenda.

Mireau, the developer of a teacher evaluation inservice materials sponsored by the Alberta Department of Education, noted that "The most frequent excuses for providing only a minimal amount of teaching supervision-- or for avoiding the task altogether-- include lack of time and the risk of destroying good rapport with teachers" (p. 13).

McGreal (1990) stressed that the most effective evaluation system is the quality of what occurs at the bottom of the system - the relationship that exists between the supervisor and the teacher when they meet one to one.

Development of collaborative cultures. Haughey and Ratsoy (1993) identified teachers recognized for their competence and given responsibilities for identifying their own goals as being the most positive about the evaluation process. Their administrators acted out of the belief that the teacher was competent. Frequently, their professional goals were seen as contributing to the achievement of school-wide goals. This clearly aligns itself to the site-based management philosophy. "Site based management suggests an evaluation model much more closely allied to results and to context than do other evaluation models (O'Reilly, 1995, p. 8).

Central to O'Reilly's comment is collaborative leadership. "Staff involvement and development are key factors in collaborative leadership" (Shantz, 1993, p. 3). Nias, Southworth and Yeomans suggest schools characterized by collaborative cultures are places where "failure and uncertainty are not protected and defended, but shared and discussed with a view to gaining help and support" (Fullan & Hargreaves, 1991, p. 48). Collaborative cultures are places which facilitate commitment to change, where individuals are valued and so is interdependence.

Collaborative cultures challenge teachers to reflect upon their existing practices, to explore alternative program delivery strategies and to reconsider beliefs held about their roles as educators. This is reflective of a healthy organization. The relationships between effective evaluation and the healthy organization were cited in the research of Maynes et al. (1995):

> . . . we found the exemplary teacher evaluation practices which we observed to be embedded in very healthy school organizations. Indeed, we are convinced that effective teacher evaluation practices will be found (and can be developed) only in schools with such healthy and positive cultures. (p. 8)

The creation of healthy, positive cultures does not happen by accident or overnight. The relationship between the leader and the teacher is imperative to the nurturing of a healthy organization and to the evaluation process as one important aspect of the organization. The building of trust is absolutely essential. da Costa (1995) ascertained that mutual trust exists when members of a group can safely confide to each other, take chances, take risks and either fail or succeed without diminishing their self worth. This is the foundation on which healthy organizations thrive.

Krupp (1991a) prescribed relationships between teachers and principals that are based on knowing, liking, and trust. She believed that one of the major problems in schools is lack of trust; ". . . school leaders need to know how to establish a safe, trusting environment in which people will feel secure in talking about themselves" (p. 4). As a school leader it is imperative to calculate the psychological risks and barriers that affect staff members as they participate in the evaluation process. "Fears of ridicule and feelings of inadequacy reduce the individual's comfort level and inhibit cognitive as well as affective growth" (Bennett, 1991, p. 12).

Haughey and Ratsoy (1993) made reference to the building of healthy school organizations through the understanding of the following: (a) provision of ongoing opportunities for teacher growth which are consistent with recommendations from the professional development literature; (b) establishment of school cultures which focus on student and staff improvements in learning; (c) teachers, administrators and other school-based educators visit classrooms informally so that teaching becomes less isolated; (d) the establishment of school cultures that encourage collaboration and collegial initiatives among staff members; (e) provision of release time for teacher collaboration; (f) the engagement of teachers in discussions about teaching and learning; and (g) mentoring of novice teachers with colleagues (p. 126).

The readings are full with examples of what has not worked in teacher evaluation. The general thread throughout contends processes which deal with teacher evaluation are usually "done to teachers rather than with teachers" (Ripley & Hart, 1989, p. 15). Through teachers' involvement in the design and development of the evaluation practice it will better reflect in the simplest of terms, what they are doing. It is what Fullan and Hargeaves refer to as giving voice to the teachers purpose (1991). Collaborative planning for evaluation increases the sense of teacher ownership and establishes itself as a vital link between school goals and the teacher's individual growth plan. "Through involvement in evaluation, it is believed that the staff members become committed to the development of their school" (Holly & Southworth, 1989, p. 89). With commitment and control over the evaluation process emerges trust; the essential building block which is most frequently absent.

Continuous review of policy. A final theme is that teacher evaluation policies should be constantly reviewed by all stakeholders. Hickox (1982) provided four recommendations with respect to teacher evaluation processes. They are: (a) should be cooperatively developed, (b) a continuous process, (c) criteria are clearly understood by the teacher and the evaluator, and (d) the policy is under continuous review. Burger and Bumbarger (1991) suggested that the continuous review of the policy should fulfil the following functions: (a) a linkage to the professional development focus initiated by the school district, (b) the building of trust between evaluators and evaluatees, (c) the balance between personnel needs and the teacher's professional development needs, and (d) the support of life-long education (p. 6).

Should evaluation procedures be under continuous review, there must be flexibility in the total process and its application to those who are affected by it. With this flexibility, may come alternative approaches which could strengthen the summative evaluation process when used either in connection, a part of or may serve as a supplementary function. Two such alternative approaches could be teacher portfolio assessment and the role of peer supervision.

Alternative Methods of Assessment

Teaching portfolio.

A teaching portfolio is a "collection of information about a teacher's practice.

It can include a variety of information, such as lesson plans, student assignments, teachers' written descriptions, and videotapes of their instruction, and formal evaluation by supervisors" (Wolf, 1996, p. 34). Shulman cited in Wolf, Whinez and Hagerty (1995) defined the teaching portfolio as the structured history of a set of coached or mentored accomplishments, substantiated by samples of student work, and fully realized only through reflective writing, deliberation, and serious conversation (p. 31). A portfolio is a dynamic portrayal of teacher performance based on multiple sources of evidence (Valencia, McGinley, & Pearson, 1990). The meanings of the portfolio may vary based on what purposes the portfolio is meant to serve (Bosetti, 1996). Whatever the purpose, the ultimate aim of the portfolio is to improve teaching effectiveness (Wolf et al., 1995).

In a research project conducted by Bosetti (1996) with thirteen educators from a large urban elementary school in Calgary, it was her intent to develop an alternative approach to teacher evaluation using teacher portfolios. The focus of the project was the construction of portfolios which involved: (a) teachers in the design and the implementation, (b) the consideration of the relationship between teacher idealogy and practice, (c) the recognition of multiple teaching strategies and learning outcomes, (d) the provision of opportunities for teachers based on their own stages of development, and (e) the provision of valid information to shape and inform policy decisions and enhance school effectiveness (p. 3). The designing and implementation of the portfolios provided the teachers with opportunities for self-reflection, collegial instruction, and gave them a voice as to who they were as teachers in a variety of contexts.

A teaching portfolio should include more than just artifacts or an extended list of professional development activities (Wolf, 1991). According to Shulman (cited in Wolf et al., 1995) teaching portfolios only serve their true purpose where they become a springboard for "substantive conversations" about the quality of a teacher's work. These "substantive conversations" were the focus of the Bosetti (1996) study.

Through the "substantive conversation" amongst the teachers, administrator and facilitator, the portfolios provided an additional snapshot toward effective evaluation practice. The formal evaluation process still involved the pre-conference, classroom observation, and post-conference format. The portfolio was shared in the pre-conference session. By using the portfolio in the pre-conference session, the teachers shared with the evaluator their central beliefs as teachers, a context of their current teaching assignments, samples of instructional strategies, samples of curriculum adaptations to accommodate individual learning needs, samples of assessment strategies, evidence of their working cooperatively with school and community members and professional development goals and plans for achieving them. The portfolio served as a springboard for substantive conversation. "It [the portfolio] was both a means through which the teacher and evaluator could discuss the congruency and discrepancies between perceptions and interpretations of the teacher's performance, and a grounding for recommendations for growth and development" (Bosetti, 1996, p. 9).

Empirical evidence for the effectiveness of teaching portfolios is limited. Wolf, Whinez and Hagerty (1995) suggested that as teaching portfolios are in the earliest stages of development, further explanations are required to draw conclusions about their effectiveness. Tuckman (1995) questioned the vulnerability of the portfolio and its potential for misrepresentation, the teacher's time required to construct a portfolio and the practicality of the portfolio approach on a widescale basis.

Peer supervision. Peer supervision can also provide teachers with opportunities for "substantive conversation" aimed at improving their own teaching. In a 1993 study (Walen & DeRose) conducted in Colorado, teacher partners observed each others' classrooms, either monthly or bi-monthly. Partners met before each observation to define the focus of the lesson and then afterward to post-conference. During the year, the principal's formal and informal observations completed the evaluation process. At the end of the evaluation period, the two teachers and the principal collaborated to write a final evaluation summary. This is just one example of many in which peer observation played a role in expanding teachers' repertoires of skills and strategies. The example in Colorado, however, was one of a very few which integrated peer coaching into the evaluation process.

In Ackland's (1991) review of peer coaching literature, Valencia and Killion's (1988) definition was used to describe peer coaching. Peer coaching is "the process where teams of teachers regularly observe one another and provide support, companionship, feedback and assistance" (p. 22). Throughout the literature, the emphasis is prevalent that peer coaching is not evaluation nor is it intended to supplant summative evaluation practices. Its intent is to promote teacher collaboration and risk taking.

However varied the approaches have been to provide collegial support, two common threads are woven throughout the peer coaching programs. The intent is to be based on the observation of classroom teaching followed by constructive feedback and is aimed to enhance professional dialogue which ultimately will improve instruction.

Peer evaluation can be built upon the same premise; however its purpose would move across the continuum to provide administrators with additional data to assist them in monitoring the progress of staff. Peer evaluation has potential for improving classroom instruction but as important, for "enhancing the self-esteem and professional growth of teachers" (Singh, 1984, p. 73). Peer evaluation is beginning to emerge as a valuable tool to enhance teacher evaluation practice and the improvement of instruction (Singh, 1984; Kauchak, Peterson, & Driscoll, 1985; Hoffengardner & Walker, 1984; Cox, Garby & Johnson, 1991). Administrative criticism of peer evaluation focuses on the loss of principal's control over the evaluation process. Other criticisms include the investment of time and money needed for the process to be successful. Where principals positively view the potential of peer appraisals, is it is based on the premise that meaningful change comes from within (Walen & DeRose, 1993).

Summary

The evaluation of teachers in Alberta over the past twenty years has pivoted around two major purposes, (a) improvement of instruction to increase student achievement, and (b) accountability.

A considerable body of literature exists on the topic of teacher evaluation. Within this, several studies have focussed on teacher evaluation practices in Alberta. From the time of the initial comprehensive study conducted in 1977 to the present, not much has changed in the area of teacher evaluation in Alberta.

The substantial literature on teacher evaluation suggests that the formal evaluation process seldom results in meaningful changes in teacher behavior. It also suggests that seldom does the formal summative evaluation process result in an improvement in student learning. The already fragile relationship between the principal and the teacher is not positively enhanced by involvement in the summative evaluation process.

A theme throughout the literature stresses the importance of trust between principal and teachers for successful teacher evaluation practices. For such relationships to occur, school leaders need to know how to establish environments that promote collegial initiatives, collaboration amongst the major stakeholders and the facilitation of risk taking all toward improving the delivery of programming to students. Collaborative planning for evaluation increases the sense of teacher ownership, builds trust and establishes itself as a vital link between school goals and the teachers' individual growth plan. Furthermore, teacher evaluation policies need to be constantly reviewed by all stakeholders to secure a realistic balance between bureaucratic needs and the school goals.

Alternative approaches to summative evaluation are teaching portfolios and peer supervision. These approaches could strengthen the summative evaluation process when used as a connective component or supplementary function.

Teacher evaluation, as a process to get teachers working together to meet school goals and facilitate life long learning is essential to the improvement of student achievement. With commitment and an invested sense of control over the evaluation process emerges trust; the essential building block for exemplary teacher evaluation practices.

CHAPTER 3

Method

This chapter provides a description of the method used to conduct this study. The research took the form of a multiple site case study. Differences existed in the ethnic composition and socio-economic demographics of the sites. This was intentional as part of the research pursued whether this diversity was a factor in the evaluation process.

In a naturalistic study, "the purpose is to develop a body of knowledge unique to the context of the study" (personal communication with da Costa, October, 1995). The narratives of the participants and patterns that emerge within these reflections were described. These reflections provide "thick" description which the readers, dependent upon their own backgrounds and experiences and their ability to be critical of the observations, may then produce transferable links. It is recognized, however, that these narratives cannot be generalized across other situations.

Sampling

The target population included elementary school principals and certified elementary classroom teachers in site based decision-making settings. The accessible population included 135 elementary schools in a large urban district in Western Canada. Stratified and purposive sampling techniques were employed in the selection of the schools and the principals.

The sample represented principals and teachers from five schools in five geographical locations; specifically the north-east, north-west, inner city, south-east, and south-west areas of a large urban city (see Table 3.1). Enrollment at the sites ranged from 200 to 350 students.

The geographical locations varied in ethnic composition, economic equity, and residential stability. Contact was made with the municipality's planning department for demographic information for each location. Basic demographic information for each school is briefly summarized below.

It should be noted that in the 1991 Ethnic Origin Report developed by the municipality planning department, the question of ethnic origin referred to the ethnic or cultural groups to which the respondent's ancestors belonged. Prior to 1991, only the respondents paternal ancestry was to be reported. If multiple ethnic origins were reported, only one origin was captured, resulting in one ethnic origin per respondent. For the 1991 study the restriction was removed allowing for multiple ethnic

Table 3.1

Composition of sample

City Quadrant	School	Name	Role	Years of Teaching Experience	Years of Admin. Experience	Years at This School
North-East	Juba	Julie	Principal	12	7	7
		Jane	Teacher	6	0	1
South-West	Indigo	Ivana	Principal	12	12	6
		Inga	Teacher	18	0	4
Inner City	Heartland	Harold	Principal	20	7	7
		Harriet	Teacher	6	0	6
South-East	Oak Ridge	Roy	Principal	14	20	7
		Roseanna	Teacher	4.5	0	4
North-West	Keepsake	Kit	Principal	12	11	5
		Kasandra	Teacher	7	0	6

origins. This is represented through the term "multiple responses."

The school summaries are followed by comparison tables whose purposes are to further illustrate the uniqueness of each of the sites.

Juba Elementary School

Juba Elementary School is located in the north-east quadrant of a large urban centre. It has been an established neighborhood since 1911. The Juba community has retained the character of a low density residential neighborhood with higher density housing located near major commercial developments. Single unit homes compose 70% of the area's dwellings.

The population profile of Juba is characteristic of a mature residential neighborhood. The households that include children make up 33% of the population and 40% of the population is 40 years of age or older.

The majority of the population is of multiple responses (1240), Ukrainian (545), German (235), and Dutch (185) (see Table 3.2).

The highest education level achieved (37.7%) is grades 9-13 without a secondary school certificate (see Table 3.3). This is followed by (18.2%) of the respondents possessing less than grade 9. Between

Table 3.2

Ethnic origin report as of 1991

Ethnic Origin	Juba North-East	Indigo South-West	Heartland Inner City	Oak Ridge South-East	Keepsake North-West
Aboriginal	100	0	445	35	85
Black	15	0	35	30	15
Canadian	55	75	135	90	115
Chinese	105	495	895	320	410
Croatian	10	0	25	0	40
Danish	35	10	0	15	20
East Indian	30	65	55	70	145
English	180	215	275	340	485
Filipino	0	10	0	105	145
Finnish	0	0	10	0	0
French	60	30	125	130	145
German	235	130	110	215	195
Greek	0	0	10	0	15
Hungarian	20	10	25	0	15
Irish	120	50	75	115	60
Italian	50	10	275	25	85
Japanese	0	0	0	0	20
Jewish	10	25	0	0	0
Korean	0	25	10	95	25
Lebanese	0	0	0	0	120
Multiple responses	1240	1225	940	1480	1960
Netherlands	185	15	30	95	50
Norwegian	15	30	10	0	0
Other	115	80	150	190	220
Other British	10	0	0	10	10
Polish	85	10	205	65	60
Portuguese	85	0	110	0	0
Scottish	100	80	75	105	105
Spanish	30	0	65	45	0
Swedish	0	0	10	10	40
Ukrainian	545	180	295	150	395
Vietnamese	0	0	215	0	50
Yugoslavian	10	0	20	10	0
Total Responses	3445	2770	4630	3745	5030

Table 3.3

Highest level of education achieved by respondents (1991)

Highest Education Level	Juba North-east	Indigo South-west	Heartland Inner City	Oak Ridge South-east	Keepsake North-west
Less than grade 9	18.2%	1.0%	31.4%	7.0%	5.6%
Grades 9-13 without secondary school certificate	37.7%	14.1%	28.8%	20.9%	30.2%
Grades 9-13 with secondary school certificate	13.3%	7.1%	9.3%	16.5%	15.0%
Trades certificate or diploma	2.8%	2.0%	1.9%	3.1%	3.8%
Other non-university education with diploma	14.8%	15.9%	11.6%	23.3%	19.2%
Other non-university education without diploma	5.5%	4.3%	5.3%	9.8%	9.5%
University without degree	5.4%	13.1%	6.2%	9.1%	8.9%
University with degree	2.3%	42.6%	5.5%	10.2%	7.8%

$30,000-39,999 is the income range of 18% of the households (see Table 3.4). Another 17% of the household incomes are between $20,000-$29,999.

The proportion of respondents being mobile within the last year of the residency report (1993) was 16.7%. Those who moved from inside the city – the year the residency report was conducted (1993) – was 13.7% followed by 1.7% from within the province, 0.8% within Canada and 0.5% from other nations (see Table 3.5). A representative from the municipal planning department inferred that this mobility probably occurred within the apartment community residents and those living in the older, less maintained, smaller rental homes scattered throughout Juba.

Indigo Elementary School

Indigo Elementary School is located in an affluent neighborhood in the south-west quadrant of a large urban city. The neighborhood is uniformly single unit houses built during the 1980's. Almost all of the houses are owner occupied. The housing styles vary from large luxury homes on spacious lots to more modest, yet costly, executive style housing. Households that have children account for 63% of all households. There are high

Table 3.4

Household income of respondents (1991)

Income Range	Juba	Indigo	Heartland	Oak Ridge	Keepsake
$0 - 9,999	10%	2%	33%	1%	5%
$10,000 - 14,999	7%	0%	20%	5%	6%
$15,000 - 19,999	10%	2%	10%	5%	6%
$20,000 - 29,999	17%	2%	11%	7%	13%
$30,000 - 39,999	18%	3%	10%	20%	15%
$40,000 - 49,999	9%	10%	6%	12%	14%
$50,000 - 59,999	11%	8%	3%	17%	14%
$60,000 - 69,999	9%	9%	3%	12%	8%
$70,000+	10%	65%	4%	22%	18%

proportions of young people under 10 years of age and adults inthe 30 to 49 year age group.

The majority of the population is of multiple responses (1225), Chinese (495), East Indian (215), and Ukrainian (180) (see Table 3.2). The highest education level is university with a degree (42.6%). This is followed by (15.9%) of the respondents possessing other non-university education with a diploma (see Table 3.3). Over $70,000 per year is the income for 65% of the households (see Table 3.4). It is an extremely stable community with 8.2% of the respondents either having moved from inside the city, within the province, Canada or from another nation for the year (1993) the residency report was compiled (see Table 3.5). One of the factors influencing this stability is the unavailability of rental properties.

Heartland Elementary School

Heartland Elementary School is located in the inner city of a large urban centre. The community's beginnings date to the early 1900's. The demographic profile shows high proportions of males, single adult households, and mobile individuals.

It is a community with a high ethnic mix. The majority of the population is of multiple responses

Table 3.5

Residency status of respondents (1993)

Residency Status	Juba	Indigo	Heartland	Oak Ridge	Keepsake
STABLE:					
Same residency (5+ years)	51.6%	38.6%	43.6%	48.5%	47.6%
Same residency (3-4 years)	12.7%	27.2%	14.2%	16.6%	12.1%
Same residency (1-2 years)	15.0%	24.7%	20.1%	20.2%	21.8%
MOBILE:					
Moved inside the city	13.7%	5.9%	17.7%	11.5%	13.0%
Moved within province	1.7%	0.6%	1.7%	1.3%	2.1%
Moved within Canada	0.8%	0.8%	1.2%	0.5%	1.3%
Moved from other nation	0.5%	0.9%	0.7%	0.3%	0.5%
	(16.7%)	(8.2%)	(21.3%)	(13.6%)	(16.9)
NEWBORN CHILDREN:					
Newborn Children	1.1%	1.2%	0.9%	1.1%	1.7%
UNKNOWN:					
Unknown					

(940), Chinese (895), Aboriginal (445), Ukrainian (295), Italian (275), Vietnamese (215), and Polish (205) (see Table 3.2). The highest education level (31.4%) is less than grade nine. This is followed by (28.8%) of the respondents possessing grades 9-13 without a secondary certificate (see Table 3.3). Between $0 and $9,999 is the income range of 33% of the households. Another 20% of the household incomes fall between $10,000-$14,999 (see Table 3.4). It is a transient community with 21.3% of the respondents either having moved from inside the city, within the province, from Canada, or from another nation, for the year (1993) the residency report was compiled (see Table 3.5). This is primarily due to the abundance of rental apartments and the high proportion of single males and single adult households.

Oak Ridge Elementary School

Oak Ridge Elementary School is located in a middle to upper middle income area in a multicultural south-east quadrant of a large urban city. Residential development in Oak Ridge began in 1974 and was completed by the end of the decade.

High density housing and commercial sites are located along main roadways and near recreational areas. Single unit structures make up 78% of the housing units in Oak Ridge; 20% are in row housing. The demographic profile of Oak Ridge is typical of many new suburban areas. Children compose 67% of the households and there is a high proportion of young people under the age of 19 and adults in the 30-49 year age group.

The majority of the population is of multiple responses (1480), East Indian (340), Chinese (320), French (215), and other (190) (see Table 3.2). The highest education level (23.3%) is other non-university education with diploma. This is followed by (20.9%) of the respondents possessing grades 9-13 without a secondary certificate (see Table 3.3). Over $70,000 per year is the income range of 22% of the households. Another 20% of the household incomes fall between $30,000-$39,000 (see Table 3.4). Those respondents being mobile within the last year of the residency report (1993) included 13.6% of the population. Those who moved from inside the city the year the residency report was conducted (1993) was 11.5%. This was followed by 1.3% moving within the province, 0.5% from Canada and 0.3% from other nations (see Table 3.5). The availability of row housing is a variable in this residency status.

Keepsake Elementary School

Keepsake Elementary School is located in the north-west quadrant of a large urban centre. Development in Keepsake began in the early 1970's and construction continued into the end of the 1980's. Multi-unit structures are an integral part of the neighborhood and are situated along the main roadways.

The demographic profile is similar to other fully developed suburban neighborhoods. Over one-half of the households are composed of adults with one or more children. This community has an above average proportion of its residents in the 0-19 age group and 87% of the residents are under 50 years of age.

It is an ethnically diverse community within a low to upper middle income range. The majority of the population are of multiple responses (1960), English (485), Chinese (410), Ukrainian (395), and other (220) (see Table 3.2). The highest education level (30.2%) is grades 9-13 without a secondary school certificate. This is followed by (19.2%) of the respondents possessing other non-university education with diploma (see Table 3.3). Over $70,000 per year is the income range of 18% of the households. Another 15% of the household incomes fall between $30,000-$39,999. Incomes ranging from $40,000 - $69,999 was representative of 36% of the households (see Table 3.4). Those respondents being mobile within the last year of the residency report (1993) was 16.9%. Those who moved from inside the city the year the residency report was conducted (1993) was 13.0% of the population. This was followed by 2.1% moving from within the province, 1.3% from within Canada, and 0.5% from other nations (see Table 3.5). The availability of low cost multi-unit housing may be a contributor to the mobility of Keepsake's residents.

Ethical Considerations

Initial contact with principals and teachers was made by telephone. The purpose and the nature of the research was shared in the telephone conversation. In addition, the principals and teachers were informed that they had the right to withdraw from the project without prejudice and information that may place their confidentiality at risk would not be divulged. Copies of the transcripts were provided to each participant and any information that was deemed "sensitive" was deleted. Ethical considerations were again shared before commencing the interviews. To assure confidentiality the names and locations of the participants were given pseudonyms in the study.

Data Collection

Data were collected in two ways: (a) interviews, and (b) a review of relevant documentation. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with principals and certified teachers at their respective schools. The semi-structured approach allowed for comparable information to be gathered from each of the participants simultaneously allowing for deviation from the format when it appeared that the participant had relevant information that went beyond the scope of the pre-determined questions.

The first cluster of questions addressed sub-problem one. Their focus was on how the evaluation was conducted at the individual school site. The second bank of questions addressed sub-problem two. These questions identified what influenced the criteria used in the summative process. The third bank of questions addressed sub-problem three: the effect that the process of evaluation has on the relationship between administrator and teachers at each respective school. The final bank of questions addressed sub-problem four. The purpose of this final category of questions was to explore certified teachers' views as to whether the results of the summative evaluation were valuable in adding to their repertoire of skills and to what extent.

These questions were piloted prior to interviewing the participants for the main study. A pilot sample of two individuals was selected from the same large urban district. Both were employed in distinctly different communities. Based on the information acquired from the pilot sample, the sequence of two interview questions were changed to elicit the desired information.

All participants granted permission for the interviews to be audiotaped. Each was transcribed and provided to the participant to review, confirm, or revise.

Validity of the Research

Throughout the research process I kept a personal diary in which perceptions about the process, participants, and context were recorded. New ideas and insights from each interview were documented to facilitate the research process.

The review of the documents included the board policy and, if available, the individual school's performance appraisal plans. These documents provided a basis for discussion and confirmation of information shared during the interview process. Through the two types of data collection, triangulation occurred avoiding mono-operational bias.

Selection and interaction with selection had potential to pose problems. The participants were volunteers willing to be involved. However, this is a limitation of all social science research.

Reliability of the interview implementation posed a potential threat as there existed the possibility the researcher could lead the participant to the answer she would prefer to hear. For every three interviews, the researcher had an independent person audit the tapes to do a "check and balance" to minimize the possible threats of hypothesis guessing, evaluation apprehension, and reliability of interview implementation.

Data analysis. The data were examined using content analysis on an ongoing basis throughout the research process. As the interviews were conducted and the data were analyzed, recurring themes began to emerge. The recurring themes provided the structure around which the data were organized and reported in the thesis.

Delimitations. The study was delimited to the elementary school principals and teachers, who at the time of the study, were employed by the large urban district. Furthermore, the study was delimited to only summative evaluation procedures used in the individual schools.

Limitations. The ability to generalize to other schools on the basis of the findings was limited in that the research will only reflect the responses of a select group; therefore applicable only to those involved in the study. It was also limited to working with volunteers.

Summary

In summary, this multiple site case study included 5 elementary schools in site based decision making settings in a large urban district. The geographical locations varied in ethnic composition, economic equity, and residential stability. Demographic information for each location was provided by the municipality's planning department. Further data was collected through semi-structured interviews and a review of relevant information. A pilot sample was undertaken prior to the main study. The data collected for both the pilot and the main study were examined using content analysis. Through content analysis, recurring themes emerged which provided the structure around which the data were reported in the thesis.

CHAPTER 4

Findings

This chapter has been organized into four sections. The first three deal with both principal and teacher perceptions regarding evaluation while the last section addresses only teacher perceptions regarding evaluation. The first section addresses how the evaluation was conducted at the school site. The second section examines what influenced the criteria used in the summative process. The third section views the effect the evaluation process had on the relationship between principal and teacher. The fourth section reports teachers' views as to whether the results of the summative evaluation were valuable for enhancing pedagogy.

How the Evaluation Was Conducted at the School Site

District policy for evaluation. Effective June 1, 1995, the board policy stated that "the board believes that an on-going process of planning and support for improved staff performance, including evaluation, is essential in achieving the mission of the district"

(Staff Performance - Board Policy GGC.BP, Staff Performance Handbook, 1995, p. 1.1.3).

In addition, staff performance was identified in the mission statement adopted by the board in 1992.

> The mission of the district, advocate of choice, is to ensure success of all students in their goals of schooling, and to assure the parents of each child and the community as a whole that the mission is being accomplished, through *exemplary staff performance*, program diversity, measured student achievement of outcomes, and site-based decision making, and by reinforcing the responsibilities and commitment of parents, students, and community (Staff Performance Handbook, 1995, p. 1.1.1).

The mission was further clarified in the district's vision of what it will look like in June, 1998. The "vision" for staff included confidence in the board, the district, themselves and their schools, staff will be principled and behave with integrity, will be highly trained, skilled and motivated, committed to continuous improvement, are skilled self-evaluators and critical self appraisals, service-oriented and will feel valued and respected by the organization (Staff Performance Handbook, 1995, p. 1.1.2).

Administrative regulation (GGC.AR) specifies that each staff member shall be responsible for his or her performance. The principal shall be responsible for the evaluation of the staff member's performance. Staff should be encouraged to actively participate in planning, evaluating, and enhancing or improving their performance. Written evaluations of the staff member's performance as related to the responsibilities of the position shall be completed for staff at least once every three years. Written evaluations of staff members' performance may be completed more frequently at the discretion of the supervisor or staff member. Principals shall be responsible for placing the original written evaluation in staff members' personnel files and for ensuring that staff members receive copies of all written evaluations. Written evaluations shall be treated in confidence and, as such, access shall be restricted to the staff member, supervisor and district staff requiring information to make administrative decisions.

The written evaluations shall include five components. First, a brief description of the assignment(s) during the evaluation period, including number and nature of students will be made by the principal. Second, an assessment of the staff members' performance related to student learning, growth and development, professional responsibilities in relation to students, colleagues, parents and the community will be made by the principal. Third, an assessment of the application of planning and preparation, classroom organization and management, instructional strategies, assessment strategies, communication skills and personal/professional attributes in addressing the above criteria will be made by the principal. Other criteria may be included at the discretion of the supervisor or staff member. Fourth, comments and signatures by the supervisor or staff member will also be included in the evaluation. Fifth, an addendum outlining the professional development activities and extra-curricular responsibilities undertaken during the evaluation period will also form part of staff members' formal evaluations (Staff Performance Handbook, 1995, p. 1.1.5-1.1.6).

The key players which critically influence the evaluation process are the individuals who must carry out the district policy and its action; the principal and staff member(s) at each of the school sites.

As part of their interviews for this study, principals and teachers were asked to share their thoughts and experiences regarding the implementation of the board policy at the school site, the process used to implement this policy, and the strengths and weaknesses of it.

General perceptions. The principals and teachers were asked to share their general thoughts in regard to the implementation of the district policy. The five principals and five teachers perceived the passing of the district policy as being positive.

It was suggested that since the policy clearly directed summative evaluations be conducted at each individual school site, teachers would be regularly evaluated. Some of the respondents felt that prior to this district policy, this practice may not have been as consistently adhered to. The policy mandates that written evaluations of the staff members' performance be completed at least once every three years. This can be translated to involve approximately one-third of the staff each year. The direct effect of this was favorably perceived as a decreased work load for the administrator. Finally, the information gathered and placed on teacher's personnel files was seen as being useful in helping principals make future staffing decisions. This perception was echoed by several principals:

> I do believe that every teacher deserves an evaluation, whether it's formative or summative, and I don't believe every teacher was getting it. So, in effect, it forces our hand (Principal Ivana, Indigo School).

> Everyone will have a written performance appraisal on file . . . I think it's important that there be information on the file. There's not enough information on most files that gives any indication of a particular staff member's focus, performance, or demonstration of their teaching (Principal Kit, Keepsake School).

The teachers' positive responses were more central to the completed evaluation document as being beneficial to securing another teaching position within the district. Four of the five teachers spoke specifically about the implementation of the district policy at the school site as a method to increase the accountability of those being evaluated. As the required criteria were laid out in the regulation, it was suggested that this facilitated consistency and consequently, fairness across the district as to how teachers were to be evaluated. One of the teachers whose school site was situated within the confines of one of the wealthiest quadrants of the city felt this recorded confirmation of teachers' performances could serve as a possible defense against difficult parents.

> I think it just bumps up the accountability. I know for me, just knowing that setting goals and whatever

> and working through the process, just makes you more accountable because . . . it just does (Teacher Inga, Indigo School).

> I think the evaluation is being conducted with specific guidelines written down. Steps that need to be followed. It's going to be an evaluation that will be the same for everyone because it will be an evaluation that is used across the board. I don't know what liberties principals would have to change content of the evaluation or to skip content of the evaluation, but it would seem to me that teacher from School A and teacher from School Z would all be evaluated in the same manner. It is much like giving all the grade 12s across the province the same provincial exam in the same subject area. There is a certain fairness about it (Teacher Roseanna, Oak Ridge School).

The implementation of the district policy at the school site was influenced by general perceptions of the policy, leadership style, the existing beliefs of those most effected and past and present experiences with former evaluation processes. The administrator's ability to take on the role of an effective change agent was another factor. District resources and inservices conducted to assist principals develop action plans to implement staff evaluation processes in their schools would also influence the implementation of the policy.

Principal preparation for the process. With the passing of the board policy emerged a staff performance handbook. The role of the Staff Performance Handbook was to "provide a number of tools (guidelines, processes, samples) that could be used by supervisors and staff to develop skill in establishing performance criteria, standards, and goals, providing and receiving feedback about specific performance dimensions, coaching to enhance or improve performance and to develop skill in documenting and reporting performance accomplishments, strengths, and areas for growth" (Staff Performance Handbook, 1995, p. 1.1.4).

The role of the Staff Performance Handbook in shaping the implementation of the policy at the school site was met with mixed responses. Samples of performance evaluation documents were made available to assist schools as they developed their own performance reporting documents that complied with the reporting framework outlined in the administrative regulation. These appeared to be the most useful elements of the Staff Performance Handbook.

Criticism was directed toward the late arrival of the Staff Performance Handbook. One principal felt that the philosophical overtone of the staff performance handbook prevented it from being a practical tool to assist administrators.

> We have a Staff Performance Handbook but what I was looking for was something that was going to make my job a little easier. That wasn't in there . . . I was disappointed with the initial handbook when I saw it because the message that we were given I thought was very clear as to what we needed. What we got did not look like anything that I thought it would look like. I thought this would be a helpful handbook and I found it more philosophical and perhaps creating even more work for me than I needed at this point to get the job done as I saw it needed to (Principal Roy, Oak Ridge School).

The purpose of the Staff Performance Handbook was to provide a basis of knowledge about staff performance evaluation. To support the handbook and assist principals in developing and implementing their staff performance evaluation process, inservices were available for district staff on several topics including an overview of the Staff Performance Handbook, performance planning, performance support, and performance reporting. The response to the delivery of the inservices, similar to the reactions to the Staff Performance Handbook, were mixed.

Two of the principals questioned the quality of the inservice education that was provided by the school district for administrators. It was not the message that was being questioned; rather the messengers. The presenters were individuals from either Personnel or Consulting Services who brought no previous school administration experience with them. Their lack of credibility among school site administrators manifested itself through poor attendance at the sessions, the principals, who did attend, being vocal in their frustration and a refusal to attend an activity that was not perceived as being beneficial. Furthermore, it was also suggested that there were inconsistencies among the messages being delivered by these presenters.

> There were some sessions available. I did not take advantage of them, either through time constraints or the fact that I didn't think it was going to help an awful lot (Principal Roy, Oak Ridge School).

> One of the inservices I was at, I was one of three people. And I found that really disappointing,

> thinking am I the only one who's not understanding this or left floundering with this? Where is everyone else (Principal Kit, Keepsake School)?

> . . . at that time there was to be inservicing and it was found that the inservicing wasn't meeting the needs of the document because a lot of it was done by consultants who hadn't had to ever have written a summative evaluation before and so we were getting frustrated. . . . The principals were vocal in their, I guess, frustration, that the inservicing was not done by people who had experience in doing summative evaluations . . . but the concern was the different consultants were giving different messages (Principal Julie, Juba School).

In general, both the principals' and teachers' perceptions of the policy were favorable. The ways in which the policy was carried out was reflected in their willingness to shape the process at their school, their involvement and lastly, their attitudes, as a consequence of their involvement.

Who was involved? The principals and teachers were asked to discuss what process was used at their particular school site to implement the board policy and the strengths and weaknesses of the process.

As there were some similarities with the processes developed at Indigo, Oak Ridge, and Keepsake, these schools are grouped together for discussion below. There existed differences between the processes used at Juba and Heartland from those previously mentioned schools. As no similarities were identified between Juba and Heartland, processes used at the schools are discussed separately.

Juba Elementary School

At Juba Elementary, there is evidence of the manipulation of the policy in the staff's attempt to blend one of the three established models, which were being promoted in the staff performance handbook, into a document which best met the needs of the school. This process was being shaped by five people directly involved in the summative evaluation process and, of course, the administrator, Julie. She was a key player in bringing about the adoption of this mandated policy. Julie arranged a process which involved individual motivation, staff commitment, and interpersonal cooperation.

> They [the five staff being evaluated] have the three prototype models and I've given them information out of the staff performance binder which gives quality indicators for a successful teacher. I have asked them to look at those qualities and say, "if we were looking for a new teacher to come to this school, what qualities would we want?" What characteristics of a successful teacher do we need in regards to meeting the 3% achievement increase, and looking at the clientele in the community, the parents . . . (Principal Julie, Juba Elementary).

Through involvement in the development of the process, the teacher, Jane, had become committed to it. She felt positive about the staff involvement and the openness of the process.

> . . . one of the first things that we had to do was sit down and decide as a staff, in our particular community, what kinds of attributes should a teacher have? We brainstormed and the principal recorded our ideas and they were presented to staff. The nice part about this is there are no secrets. Everything that we do in our meetings is brought back to a staff meeting (Teacher Jane, Juba Elementary).

As part of Julie's repertoire of leadership skills the yearly evaluation of all teaching staff over the past seven years with Julie in the role of principal has been an established practice. The previous process for evaluation at Juba consisted of teacher goal setting, the teacher's plan on how to reach the goal and whether or not the goal was met was determined collaboratively by the teacher and Julie. This was further blended with two formal observations by Julie, daily informal classroom visits, and finally, Julie's written judgement of the teacher's performance. To place this document on the teacher's personnel file remained an option.

The two most obvious changes since the implementation of the district policy was the formatting of the evaluation document and no longer will placing the document in the teacher's personnel file remain an option. As the previous document did not have all the requirements, as outlined in the staff performance handbook, coupled with the additional criteria generated by the Juba evaluation committee, minor changes were required.

> . . . I don't believe that it is any different than what we've done before. . . . the staff have been with me for a long time so that they're familiar with the process. I think the nice thing about it

> this year is that we've had to make a more concentrated effort in working to make sure everybody knows what's expected. The format is the only thing going to change this year because our old format didn't have all the requirements in it (Principal Julie, Juba School).

Julie felt that there being little difference between the established practice and the district policy was a strength of the school initiated process. Further discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of how the evaluation was conducted at the school site will be discussed further in the following section.

Strengths and Weaknesses

Strengths.

Julie and Jane were asked what the strengths and weaknesses were of the process that was implemented at Juba Elementary.

Perceptions shared by Julie and Jane in regards to the strength of the process included the involvement of staff and the staff's input into shaping the document to make it more school specific. The self-evaluation component of the document was heralded by Jane as being a valuable avenue for teacher growth. This also aligned with Jane's belief that the evaluation process at Juba was a necessary confirmation of the "things" one, as a teacher, does day to day.

> The reason I like it is I think it is really important that number one, the teacher have input and I think it's really neat to see how the teacher perceives herself and how the administrator might perceive her. And the difference, when there are discrepancies for example, that might be the area that you need to go back and look at. For example, if you perceive yourself to be strong in using a variety of assessment strategies, you give yourself a 4. If the administrator gives you a 2, ranks you at a 2, that might be one that you need to discuss. You might have to prove . . . to justify why you gave yourself a 4, which I think is fair, and that might be an area that you might use for growth (Teacher Jane, Juba School).

Jane also perceived the evaluation process as a vehicle to make principals more accountable in working with teachers experiencing difficulty.

> . . . it's going to help teachers, it's going to start weeding them out, those in difficulty and those who are doing a good job. I think it's time

> that teachers who are doing a good job be acknowledged and that people who are not doing a good job, or need to grow, be dealt with (Teacher Jane, Juba School).

Jane felt that the implementation of the policy increased administrator accountability, however, she also voiced concerns that the three year cycle could possibly contribute to decreased teacher accountability. This will be discussed further in the section following.

Weaknesses. The district policy includes the requirement that a written evaluation be completed for every staff member at least once every three years. Jane felt that if no other process was in place to monitor staff performance in between the three year reporting periods, it could be perceived by her fellow professionals as an opportunity to maintain the status quo as opposed to an opportunity to grow.

> Like I said, if I could, I would like to have one every year rather than every three years. But what happens if you're not being evaluated? I know I'll still be accountable for the next few years. What about those teachers, and there are teachers out there, who can slough off? What happens in those

> two years that you're not being evaluated? Is there going to be some kind of accountability there? If you're being evaluated, of course you're going to be volunteering for this and volunteering for that, if you were smart. What about the other two years, I mean, if there is a drop off without a particular reason. Wouldn't you be questioned on it? (Teacher Jane, Juba School).

Julie's credibility as an evaluator was not questioned by Jane. Jane respected and trusted Julie. Jane did suggest, however, the administrator's credibility would greatly influence the degree to which the teacher embraces the evaluation process. Jane admits she may have felt differently about being evaluated should the administrator evaluating her be perceived as lacking credibility in their role as educational leader.

Jane wondered whether the final document being developed by each school throughout the district would cause inconsistencies. She was concerned with the document becoming so general that it would provide little information to those who have access to the personnel file. It was her wish that the document be as specific as possible.

> When we were going through, when we were slogging through this stuff, I wanted specific. When we talk about planning, what are we talking about? Long range planning, short term planning? I want it so specific, not incredibly specific that it's going to be a 50 page document, but so that it is not Greek to the next administrator. I want them to know exactly what we're talking about (Teacher Jane, Juba School).

The only weakness identified by Julie in the implementation of the policy at Juba was a lack of time. This was coupled with the Staff Performance Handbook arriving late in the Fall.

> I think the weaknesses of the process is that we're in February already and the teachers aren't, I mean, we've worked, I've met with them on "one-on-ones" on two occasions, and we still haven't got a plan in place (Principal Julie, Juba School).

In summary, strengths identified by Jane were the involvement of staff, the self-evaluation component and principals being held more accountable in working with teachers experiencing difficulty. Julie also identified the involvement of staff in designing a model that was "school specific" as a definite strength.

Weaknesses shared by Jane were the gap between evaluation cycles, evaluator expertise and credibility, and the potential inconsistency across the district in evaluation documents. The only weakness identified by Julie was lack of time.

Heartland Elementary School

At Heartland School, the process in which teachers were formally evaluated was based upon a commercially developed evaluation package which was piloted by one staff member the year prior.

The request for summative evaluations was spearheaded by staff, not the pending implementation of a district policy. This request occurred two years prior to the time data for the present study were gathered. The reason why this request unfolded emerged shortly thereafter the first reduction in provincial educational funding was announced. At that particular time, should the teachers in the district not have accepted a 5% rollback, there was a possibility that certified staff with up to five years teaching experience were candidates for layoffs. As the teachers in the local bargaining unit accepted the rollback, these individuals with tenure of five years or less remained in their positions. Undoubtedly this did cause uneasiness amongst staff new to the profession.

This request for summative evaluation was further reinforced through the information gathered from the school district's staff attitude surveys. Staff at Heartland were not satisfied with the evaluation process.

> Overall it's something that the teachers want because the last survey results said that they weren't happy with the evaluation process, and the evaluation has always been formative. You set a goal and we go from there. I think what inspired them to request summative evaluations was the fact that we had that drastic cutback where teachers with five years experience were worried about their jobs. And, because of that, the teachers that had five years experience came to me and said formative was not enough. We want summative evaluations because we want something in our files to tell other principals we are good teachers. So I said fine, so last year we found a program we liked (Principal Harold, Heartland School).

A commercial package was purchased by Principal Harold from the Educational Administrator's Association.

It is called Evaluation and Teacher Effectiveness. At Harold's request, one teacher was asked to review it. Upon completion of the review, minor adjustments were made and another teacher was asked to pilot the commercial package. To date, she remains the only one to have undergone this process. Based on this individual's experience, five more teachers were evaluated during the 1995/96 school year through the implementation of this particular evaluation instrument. Other than these two examples of staff member input, no other staff involvement occurred with the implementation of the district policy at Heartland Elementary.

Principal Harold was the only administrator who was relying on a commercial teacher evaluation package. As the principal perceived himself as a poor writer, the commercial package was helpful in providing him with an established format and terminology. The staff performance handbook was not viewed as a valuable resource.

> I thought it would be faster and more convenient for us rather than regenerating a program so that we were ahead of the game. So when the stuff came from the district it looked too cumbersome. The stuff is just too much and what I liked about this (the commercial package) was that it had titles, then it

> had sub-titles and you could basically just write it. Well that's the strength of it basically, and the fact is that some people can write good reports and some people can't (Principal Harold, Heartland School).

As much as Harold was satisfied with the merits of the commercial program, he also felt restricted by its format. However, he wasn't dissatisfied to the extent that changes were made to it.

Teacher Harriet spoke specifically about the implementation of the district policy at the school site as a method to increase the accountability of those being evaluated.

> It puts the onus back on you and makes you more accountable (Teacher Harriet, Heartland School).

Strengths and weaknesses of how the evaluation was conducted at the school site will be discussed in the following section.

Strengths and Weaknesses

Strengths.

Principal Harold linked the implementation of the district policy as an avenue to heighten his own accountability as an educational leader. This was shared as a strength of the process.

> Because it does make you get into the classroom, where as you know in the inner city, you can find all kinds of reasons not to get into the classrooms because you have so many other things to do (Principal Harold, Heartland School).

As Harold felt he was held more accountable for the completion of performance appraisals, he felt that this process also increased his teachers' accountability.

> Basically, again, as long as if you're being observed, you get a little bit more conscientious regardless of who you are. No matter if you're the best teacher in the world, somebody comes in to observe you, you do a better job (Principal Harold, Heartland School).

Principal Harold viewed the district policy of conducting summative evaluation as a more effective growth tool than a formative process.

> I think that summative evaluation is even a better growth tool because it does adhere to more. Setting

> goals is fine but you can always ad lib your way out of goal setting and say, "Well, I've done this, or this happened or whatever." When you're doing summative evaluations you mind a little more. It makes you a little more conscious of your job, . . . drives you better (Principal Harold, Heartland).

As two to three formal observations by the administrator were part of the Heartland process and Harriet had control over when and what subject was to be observed, she identified this as a strength. Harriet felt considerable control over this aspect of the process. However, it is imperative to point out that eight months of the school year had passed and an observation had yet to be completed by Harold. A scheduled time was arranged in the early Spring. Harold was in the classroom for fifteen minutes but was forced to leave the classroom due to an unexpected problem in the school. At the time of the study, an alternate date for another observation with Harriet had not been established.

Weaknesses. In Harold's criticism of the process he identified lack of time to implement the district policy as a negative factor. He felt the purchasing of the commercial teacher evaluation package was a time saver. Harold did not view the staff performance handbook as a practical resource in establishing the process at Heartland. He felt by purchasing an already established package, it would be faster and more convenient than "regenerating" another program from conception.

Harriet felt there was only one weakness in the process at Heartland School. This weakness was the lack of follow through.

> There is a bit more structure to it. But that hasn't really been done yet. The intentions were there on behalf of our principal to evaluate those people who indicated that this was the year they wanted to be evaluated but haven't been evaluated yet. It's not followed through. I don't think it's so much the process as it is the person. It's only as good as the person who implements it (Teacher Harriet, Heartland School).

In summary, strengths identified by Principal Harold were increased teacher and principal accountability and his belief that the summative evaluation process was a more effective growth tool than formative procedures. Harriet, too, identified increased teaching accountability as a strength. She was also partial to the ownership she had controlling when and what subject was to be observed by Harold.

Lack of time was identified by Harold as a detriment in implementing the district policy. Harriet felt the immediate consequence of this. She felt the lack of follow through at the school site was an overriding weakness which hampered the process for her.

Indigo, Oak Ridge and Keepsake Elementary Schools

At Indigo, Oak Ridge and Keepsake Elementary Schools, the process evolved where informal input from staff being formally evaluated was blended with the principal's general guideline for performance planning and evaluation. The processes to implement the district evaluation policy were built upon established school practices. The principals felt that the policy had influenced minor change to evaluation procedures practiced at the individual school sites. It is important to point out that these administrators have had a minimum of five years at their school sites in which to shape these procedures.

> What we've done in the past is the one-on-one meetings. In the one-on-one meetings, in addition to what's happening in the classroom, showing me samples of work, showing me their program of studies for the year. I also had them think about two

> professional goals and one personal goal. They write that up, we link professional development to anything that they take in the way of inservices, should be tied to that. In addition all of this should be tied to our school plan so that we're focussed (Principal Kit, Keepsake School).

Because the staff interviewed have had previous experience with an evaluation process, the transition, viewed by the teachers, has been a smooth, positive one.

> We had a one-on-one towards the end of the year to talk about it. It was based on you have told me what your goal is and how you are going to achieve it, and it looks like you've done it. This is what you've done through the year, this is what I've noticed, this is what people have told you about. I believe these are your strengths. I believe the inservices that I attended for the year were also listed (Teacher Roseanna, Oak Ridge School).

Inga, a teacher at Indigo Elementary, spoke positively about the informal interaction between herself and the administration in regards to the implementation of the district policy. Formally, those staff involved with the process, had not met as a group. Instead it was through Ivana's daily walk abouts, informal conversations in the staff room and hallway, and the distribution of relevant printed material to key staff that the process evolved. Ivana, of the trio of administration being discussed, was the only one who encouraged staff to become familiar with the Staff Performance Handbook.

Inga felt that her involvement with a student teacher earlier in the school year was a valuable catalyst in promoting interest, not only in the Staff Performance Handbook, but to the entire evaluation process at Indigo School. Through this, she became intensely familiar with the handbook and particularly with the role of critical self-evaluation as part of a criteria to enhance teacher performance.

Principal Roy at Oak Ridge adopted a process and a document from another school where it was piloted by a singular staff member. Subsequently, it was shared with Oak Ridge staff directly affected by its adoption and accepted by them.

> We (a group of principals) were just talking about it and decided to do it. . . . We had some information that dealt with contracts for teachers who were on temporary or interim contracts, and we pulled some of that stuff together and bits and pieces that we could find and made something up that

> would fill the bill. I'm not sure how well this is going to do it and whether or not we'll be changing it over the next few years, I'm not certain. One of my colleagues has tried it with one teacher and has felt it was very successful. The staff I have spoken to about it we've just gone through the first stage and they seem to think that it will work just fine (Principal Roy, Oak Ridge).

In the process adopted by Roy at Oak Ridge, although there was not initial direct staff input into the development of the process and document, it was well received by, at least, one of the teachers directly affected by it.

> When I saw this one, I thought why can't all evaluations be like this at least? So I felt very good about it and I let Roy know that (Teacher Roseanna, Oak Ridge School).

The process at Keepsake evolved with feedback from the individuals being evaluated. The process in which the feedback was solicited was initially informal. It was four months into the school year when Principal Kit formally met with the individuals scheduled to receive a summative evaluation at year end. The purpose of the meeting was to blend further staff input with the principal's conception of performance planning and evaluation. Kit's conception of the process was influenced by the informal conversations with staff, her attendance at the district inservices dealing with summative evaluation and her previous administrative experiences with teacher evaluation.

Strengths and weaknesses of how the evaluation was conducted at the three school sites will be discussed in the following section.

Strengths and Weaknesses

Strengths. The responses from the three administrators, as to the strengths of the evaluation process, as conducted at the individual school site, were that they felt comfortable with the implementation of the district policy. All three felt that it built upon a previously existing foundation at their schools.

Two of the administrators felt that the requirement of the policy to evaluate one-third of the staff each year over a three year cycle might reduce the work load. With the reduction of the work load, this enhanced the possibility that the focus of the evaluation be deeper in its scope.

> But in the past, I have done 30 a year and I don't think that I've given effective service or maybe leadership to all the staff; that was more tokenism. And now we are going to look maybe a little more in-depth at things (Principal Ivana, Indigo).

Principal Roy spoke about the consistency of the staff performance policy in that each school will be expected to evaluate teachers on a required list of criteria. Furthermore, this allowed for consistency across the district. This was seconded by Principal Kit who felt the inadequate information on staff member's personnel files provided limited information for making personnel decisions.

Principal Ivana saw the process as an effective avenue to provide communication between the teacher and administrator. This provides for an interesting dimension when you blend this with Inga's description of the frequency of the feedback received at Indigo School. Although frequent, specific and immediate feedback already exists as part of the culture of the Indigo School, the administrator, Ivana, continued to look for ways to expand the communication network at the time of the interviews.

> We're lucky at this school. We gets lots of strokes from our administrators. You do something and it's acknowledged. Quietly. Everybody here including the teaching staff, are absolutely marvellous at thanks alot for this, or thanks for organizing that. I think that lead comes from Ivana and it has been a very important part of this school (Teacher Inga, Indigo School).

Teachers Inga and Roseanna valued the collaborative aspect of both the evaluation process and the input they were able to provide into actually shaping the evaluation document. Both felt that the self-evaluation component of the evaluation was an excellent vehicle for growth. This aligned with their overall thoughts on the implementation of the policy as a necessary confirmation of the "things" one, as a teacher, does day to day.

> I think the collaboration between the two people, it isn't one person writing the evaluation on one person. I really like that. I'm thankful people have input. Because we have such a strong principal, I guess I wouldn't worry. But in a lot of other schools, if the person doesn't really know what's happening in here, I'd be really afraid that they're going to write down is not really what's

> happening. And so this way, I think you have that input yourself (Teacher Inga, Indigo School).

Teacher Kasandra felt that the strength of the evaluation process at Keepsake School was that through the formal observation, one got a positive reaffirmation of existing practice. Planning for the formal observation brought Kasandra's skills to a conscious level. Kasandra appreciated the feedback received upon the completion of the formal observation and as the principal was not perceived as "demonstrative," the process was helpful in finding out where she stood with Principal Kit.

> . . . when she (Principal Kit) left (the classroom) I just felt almost like I was in university again, sweating out an exam. That's how I felt because I didn't know and I thought this is silly. I know what I did in there. But I lack that self assurance. I really do. I have a low self concept. But anyways, that's what she did. But then, when I went in to meet with her, it was all just very positive. And she started it out the way you're supposed to. What did you like about your class? What did you like about it, I think was the first question. Then, what didn't you like? I believe

> that's how it went. But she never made a judgement. She just observed and said this was good, this was good, this was very strong. This is what I saw. I felt it was a positive report from her, I thought, oh, maybe she does think I'm okay. You know, because I always wonder. Well you just don't know for sure, because she's not demonstrative. So this is why that was nice. . . . And I just felt good after (Teacher Kasandra, Keepsake School).

As positive as Kasandra was about the formal observation, Inga felt the opposite. Inga was pleased that the process at Indigo did not involve this particular criteria and the flexibility was identified as a strength. Frequent pop-in visits by Ivana and Roy were seen as a more effective channel in gathering data for teacher performance. Although the formal observation was seen as an effective vehicle for Kasandra to receive feedback from Kit the actual observation was stressful for her. She, too, preferred when the administrator "just wandered in" on an unscheduled basis.

This will be discussed further in the section that follows.

Weaknesses. Every principal perceived lack of time as a barrier to the development of this process. This was coupled with the Staff Performance Handbook arriving late in the Fall. Furthermore, with the demands placed on administrators in school decision based sites, insufficient time to arrange for formal classroom visits was also suggested as a weakness of not just this policy, but of any plan to monitor staff performance.

A mandatory requirement of the policy stated that the framework for what must be included in a written performance evaluation must be consistent across the district. An assessment of any staff member's performance must be related to the following criteria (a) planning and preparation, (b) classroom organization and management, (c) instructional strategies, (d) assessment strategies, and (e) communication skills and personal/professional attributes. Other criteria may be included at the discretion of the supervisor or staff member. Although this was firmly stated in the policy and its requirements, there existed a view that potential for inconsistency existed. Another view maintained that the reason for the creation of this policy was to move toward consistency across the district.

> Because form school to school, four of us got together with our evaluation instrument. They aren't even identical from those four schools. Certainly from some of my colleagues I see things

> that are quite different. So if we take that and multiply it by 189 or whatever, we're going to have a number of different ways of reaching the same, I hope, goal (Principal Roy, Oak Ridge School).

Two other school site specific weaknesses were identified by Ivana. Firstly, she felt that the process being developed at Indigo did not adequately target student achievement and the Superintendent's goal of a 3% increase in student achievement. Secondly, Ivana felt that the kinds of demands being placed on teachers and their expertise in curriculum by the parents of the Indigo community were not truly reflected in their evaluation process. Ivana did suggest, however, later in the interview that the flexibility of the board policy could be adjusted to meet these concerns.

Principal Roy was the only administrator who commented upon the summative nature of the process. He commented on the process being more principal driven rather than teacher driven, resulting in a process, not as "warm" as the one he had preferred in his 20 year tenure as administrator.

> I don't find with the requirements given ... I don't find it as warm a process that we've been able to use or at least that I feel we have been able to use

> over the years has been ... I think it came more from them than from me. I see this latest one as being a "stiffer" report on just what has happened, is it taking place, isn't it taking place, and not as much room for comments (Principal Roy, Oak Ridge).

In their criticisms of the process, there was little consensus among the five teachers. Teacher Inga was concerned of the openness of the policy and how subject it was to interpretation throughout the district. Inga felt there were no weaknesses in the process used at Indigo School to implement the policy. Instead, she saw a potential weakness from a district perspective. Her point of contention was the possibility that principals could make judgements on an individual's teaching performance based upon one forty-five minute observation. Inga felt this problem could become even more enormous should the principal be perceived as lacking credibility and expertise.

While Inga felt that formal observations did not provide adequate information in regards to teacher performance, Kasandra felt the planning of the lesson for the formal observation was a beneficial experience. The observation itself was stressful and felt like a performance. Although it was the feedback that was attached to the formal observation that was seen as worthwhile, it was viewed as a stressful approach to elicit dialogue.

The district policy includes the requirement that a written evaluation be completed for every staff member at least once every three years. Kasandra labelled this requirement as potential weakness. Should there not be another process in place to continue to encourage staff to take risks and grow, those individuals not directly effected by the district policy, could be left less accountable.

> I think one weakness is that people who didn't get evaluated this year, like this heavy duty one, yeah, I'll have two years I don't have to be evaluated. Then those of us who are, we're saying, yeah, it won't be for two years. And I don't think that's a good attitude (Teacher Kasandra, Keepsake School).

The only weakness cited by Roseanna was the lack of space on the evaluation document being piloted at Oak Ridge. At the time of writing, amendments were being made to solve this problem at the school site.

In summary, strengths identified by the principals Ivana, Roy and Kit were the potential to build upon previously built foundations at their school sites, a reduction of the work load, a move towards consistency across the district and an effective way to promote communication with teachers. Teachers, in turn, described the collaborative aspect of the process, the self-evaluation component, the positive reaffirmation of existing practice and feedback from the administrator as strengths of the process. It is obvious that principals took different views in their identification of strengths. The only similarities were the provision of feedback.

Lack of time, a potential for inconsistency across the district and the process being more principal driven rather than teacher driven were cited by the principals as weaknesses of the process. The teacher's responses were few in number and included the openness of the policy, evaluator expertise and credibility and the gap between evaluation cycles.

What Influenced the Criteria Used In the Summative Process

The principals and teachers were asked to share what factors influenced the criteria used in the summative process. In this cluster, participants spoke about their school community, its impact upon the delivery of programming, and the community's influence on the evaluation process. For this discussion, the criteria mandated by the district policy will also be included.

District Policy

According to the district policy, written evaluations for teaching staff in the classroom will include: (a) a brief description of the assignment(s) during the evaluation period, including number and nature of students; (b) an assessment of the staff member's performance related to student learning, growth and development, professional responsibilities in relation to students, colleagues, parents and the community; (c) an assessment of the application of the following qualities in addressing the above criteria, as well as, planning and preparation, classroom organization and management, instructional strategies, assessment strategies, communication skills and personal/professional attributes. Other criteria may be included at the discretion of the supervisor or staff member.

There also existed discretionary options that each school could adapt to meet their individual needs. These include (a) determining the process for evaluating staff performance, (b) deciding which permanent staff will have written performance evaluations completed in each year of the three year cycle, (c) determining whether additional performance criteria will be added for teaching staff in the classroom, and (d) determining the standards that will be used to measure whether criteria have been met (Staff Performance Handbook, 1995, p. 1.1.10).

The final written evaluation will summarize and document a staff member's performance within the framework that was outlined in the previous paragraphs.

Programming Considerations

Of the five teachers and five administrators, only one individual, Principal Kit from Keepsake Elementary, felt that the make-up of the community should not be a consideration in the criteria for the evaluation of staff. Her responses were embraced in that adage, "a teacher is a teacher is a teacher."

> Delivering the program is expected from all of us. However, accommodating or meeting the needs of kids doesn't mean that you do not cover the program. It also does not mean that you have different standards of performance. So whether you're in a low socio-economic area or a high socio-economic area, the standard of performance still has to be there. You still have to be able to provide the program, meet the needs of students, and do a damn good job of it.

> You still have to meet student achievement, student safety, all those other things that are part and parcel, regardless of where you're at. Performance cannot become ineffective because you happen to be working with lower class students or lower middle class students. There are challenges, but there are challenges within every classroom because you have the range of students and the levels of differing abilities and differing ways of providing for their learning needs. . . . I think performance is performance (Principal Kit, Keepsake).

The teacher at Keepsake, Kasandra, did not share the same belief as her administrator. She believed that the make-up of the community should be a consideration since teachers deal with community related issues on a day to day basis. Kasandra compared the children at Keepsake where there is a predominance of low socio-economic families to those children in a wealthy community and the differences in the delivery of programming to children who come with life experiences and the benefit of good parenting. Kasandra maintained this to be a definite influence in teacher behavior in the classroom. As adjustments need to be made in the delivery of programming, not only in Keepsake Elementary but in an affluent community as well, she felt this should be taken into consideration.

When Kasandra was asked what the differences would be in a more affluent area, she maintained the children would come to school with life experiences which result in the teacher being required to enrich her program to accommodate for these students. Either way, the socio-economic factors play an important role in what decisions the teacher makes in the delivery and certainly, the adjustment of curriculum.

Both the teacher and the administrator at Indigo, an affluent community, felt the manner in which teachers accommodate the delivery of programming for students is a strong reflection of meeting community needs. According to Ivana and Inga, it should, therefore, be a consideration as part of the criteria to evaluate staff.

> Our kids' basic needs are met, they come to school well-fed, clothed, ready to learn. So in the true sense of the word, teaching happens here, because the teachers don't have anything to take care of but the curriculum. What would also happen is that the bare bones curriculum or the curriculum as it sits is only a skeleton. We have to put some meat on that skeleton for these kids, for the majority of them (Principal Ivana, Indigo).

Ivana made reference to these children as "designer" kids; kids who are good average kids who come to school well-fed, well-clothed and as a consequence, teachers at Indigo are there to "teach." Should the teachers not be attending to the curriculum and not be delivering beyond what Alberta Education mandates they should deliver, it would reflect how they perform in the classroom. This would not be meeting the needs of the community.

The Heartland community's impact on the delivery of programming, which directly influences teacher decision making, is enveloped within poverty, unemployment, high incidence of one parent families, drug and alcohol abuse, and high frequency of crime. Although the composition of the Heartland community had a direct effect on the delivery of programming, its uniqueness was not reflected in the commercial evaluation package. There did not exist a section which provided for a description of the classroom, nor the challenges the entire school faced.

> I mean you tend to understand that as far as achievement results are concerned you have to look at the community. Just to quote another principal who taught in the inner city and now is over in a more affluent area, "He says that he has seen the inner city teachers work three times as hard to get half the marks" (Principal Harold, Heartland).

Teacher Harriet felt the influence of the socio-economic variables on the delivery of curriculum from a day-today perspective in her grade 3/4 classroom. She spoke about the class composition and a class size of 28 students. Five of these children were coded "special needs." To be eligible for this coding, the children had to be a minimum of two years below grade level. Several children were considered behaviorally disturbed. Many came to school hungry and tired.

> It was sheer hell trying to keep classroom management. And I was really frustrated and tired. And it made my delivery of lessons, my delivery of the curriculum, even just my willingness to plan and go get other resources. I was bagged at the end of the day. And lots of times, I kind of felt like I'm not even sure if these kids deserve, it was such a challenge. So those sorts of things impact on how you deliver the program and even how you feel about being where you're at. So yes, they should be considered when you are being evaluated (Teacher Harriet, Heartland).

Harriet felt this could be adhered to in as simplistic format as a side note on the commercial evaluation document. Its purpose would be to inform the reader of the challenges the teacher faced in the classroom with its particular composition. Similar to Harriet's views, it was also reflected in both Julie's and Jane's responses that the make-up of the community should be a consideration in the evaluation of teachers at school based decision sites like Heartland and Juba Elementary.

Roy and Roseanna at Oak Ridge Elementary agreed with Kasandra, Julie, Jane, Ivana, Inga, Harold and Harriet in that the make-up of the community influenced teacher performance and teacher decision making. For Roy this viewpoint was based on over twenty years as an administrator in a variety of locations.

> Based on my experience you have teachers who could probably work very, very, very hard and end up with results coming out of their classroom that wouldn't even hope to come close to somebody who can, with one hand tied behind their back, almost guarantee that every child in their class is going to pass the benchmark, for one thing. You also have teachers who have to cope with the fact that their children are coming to school hungry in the morning. That's something you've got to take care of before you can get down to the learning. Maslow, I think, had it right. There was a hierarchy and if it wasn't taken

> care of, things didn't pan out the way you thought they should. Certainly teachers find themselves in different situations, in different areas of the city, sometimes from year to year with different classes. I think the administration and everybody else needs to be cognizant of that (Principal Roy, Oak Ridge).

Here was another example where a principal, although cognizant of the impact socio-economic influences along with other variables play at the individual school sites, did not provide for this information on the evaluation document.

Parent Involvement

Opportunities for parents to have input into the criteria has neither been presently explored or offered by either the administrator and staff nor has it been suggested by the parent council at either of the five school sites. Of the ten participants interviewed, Teachers Kasandra and Harriet felt that the Keepsake and Heartland parents should have an opportunity for direct input but not in the role of evaluator. This is interesting when visited in the context that Principal Kit from Keepsake was the only participant who felt that the make-up of the community should not be part of the criteria in the evaluation of staff.

Kit believed, however, there was an area where parents could "perhaps" look at setting criteria. This was the area as to how staff communicate with parents. Furthermore, the required criteria in the Staff Performance Handbook under the headings of professional responsibilities in relation to students, colleagues, parents, and the community and communication skills, depending on interpretation, could easily encompass this.

At this stage, the process at Juba does not include opportunities for parents to have input into the criteria to evaluate teachers. However, Julie did not rule out the possibility in the future. Once the format was in place, Julie was going to invite members of Juba's Parent Council to react to it and be given an opportunity to provide suggestions should they identify discrepancies. Jane concurred that the parameters of the parent input be strictly confined to information sharing only.

At the time of this study, Ivana did not provide parents with opportunity for input into the evaluation of teachers, nor does she plan to do so in the future. Roy believes it may be acceptable to get advice from the parent community; however, with a very clear message interwoven; the evaluation of staff is his responsibility and only his responsibility.

Inga, like Roseanna at Oak Ridge, also lived in the school community and saw the community from even a broader perspective. She felt the community already had indirect input.

> Our parents and our community are very vocal and have a lot of demands and certainly would let our administrator know what they want to see. I know when I was hired, there was a parent sitting on the selection committee, so they feel they have a voice or some input. How much she did or didn't I don't know but certainly she had that opportunity, so the feeling is there, right? I would say more indirectly than directly (Teacher Inga, Indigo).

Teacher Roseanna at Oak Ridge, although initially tolerant toward the possibility of parent involvement in the evaluation process, became increasingly hesitant about this approach as she focused more upon it. She looked upon this possibility from a combination of experiences as a member of the Oak Ridge community, her eight years experience as a director of a city operated daycare and as a classroom teacher. The final consensus Roseanna reached in her response was a favorable nod to a more indirect involvement rather than direct input.

> Well, I think they can have input into the criteria but I don't if it should be at the level where they can phone up a principal and say when you are evaluating the staff this year, this is what we want you to look for (Teacher Roseanna, Oak Ridge).

Similar to the principal-teacher pair at Keepsake, Harold did not feel parents should be provided with the opportunity for formal input. Harriet, in contrast, did. Although all the schools included in this research received (bi-yearly) results solicited from the parent community through the district parent attitude survey, only the respondents from Heartland made reference to these results as playing an indirect role in the evaluation of staff.

> I don't know . . . I mean witch hunters! I wouldn't let them get involved. . . . then of course our survey results tell us that 90% of our parents love our teachers, so whatever we are doing, we are doing well (Principal Harold, Heartland).

Of all the items discussed during the ten interviews, the influence of parents on the evaluation process remains the most contentious.

In conclusion, the district policy played a pivotal role in the establishment of criteria used in the summative process. The socio-economic variables of the school community, although considered vital in the delivery of programming, played a minor to non-existent role in the evaluation process. Opportunities for parents to have input into the criteria had neither been explored or offered at either of the five school sites.

Effect of Evaluation on Principal and Teacher Relationships

Participants were asked to share their experiences with regard to the effect of the teacher evaluation policy on the relationship between the principal and the teacher being evaluated. For greater clarity, principals and teachers were asked for specific examples of how trust was built and kept with the staff members being formally evaluated.

Principal and Teacher Relationship

All ten of the participants said the policy had created no change or difficulty in the principal-teacher relationship. Two of the ten participants felt it actually strengthened their relationship.

Teacher Kasandra felt, as a consequence of the formal observation component in the process implemented at Keepsake, the opportunity to discuss the lesson and receive feedback from the principal strengthened her relationship with Kit.

> I think it improved it because now I think she appreciates me. Where I was never that sure, because she did say a lot of positive things about the lesson. There was no negative. That's probably the plan, no negative, but it was nice to hear no negatives; none (Teacher Kasandra, Keepsake).

When asked further whether previous comments from Kit were negative, Kasandra disclosed that it was probably her perception clouded by her low self-concept where in essence, historically, over the four years, communications between Kit and Kasandra have been built on the positive. Although the formal observation left Kasandra feeling, "almost like she was in university again, sweating out an exam," the feedback Kasandra received was valuable in affirming she was an effective teacher. Principal Kit, did not see a change in the relationship, as much as a sense of relief shared by Kasandra upon the completion of the formal observation. Kit recognized the potential for stress in the formal observation process, however, maintained the more seasoned the teacher, the higher their level of concern. In sight of this, she saw her relationship with Kasandra as that of Kit taking on the role of an encourager; a coach.

Kit wanted to shift the emphasis from the accountability purpose of the district policy to one that fostered growth and promoted overall school improvement.

As Kasandra at Keepsake was the only teacher participant who saw the relationship strengthened by the process, Harold was the only principal who shared this view. In contrast, the teacher supervised by Harold at Heartland felt the process would not have any impact.

Principal Harold felt that the relationship with the staff involved in the summative evaluation process would be made stronger. Secondly, he felt that the summative evaluation forced him to get into the classroom. The consequence of the formal observations, he felt, made the teachers do a better job. It was the feedback the teachers would receive that would promote "professionalism." As integral as these formal observations were to Harold's way of thinking, it was already six months into the school year when the interview was conducted, and none of the three to four observations had been completed.

> I think it (the summative evaluation) is just going to make it stronger. Because they want feedback. Teachers really do want critical appraisals of their job and just to tell them, hey, you're doing a good job is not enough any more. They want to see appraisals. They are very conscious of the evaluation. They want evaluations from other people. I think it's professionalism (Principal Harold, Heartland).

Teacher Harriet felt the effect of the summative evaluation process on her relationship with Harold would not "have much of an impact."

> Harold hates to say anything bad about anybody. I can't see him writing anything bad about anybody (Teacher Harriet, Heartland).

At Juba Elementary, the relationship between Julie and Jane was a relatively new one. This was Jane's first year at Juba Elementary. The effect of the evaluation process appeared to play a positive role in the development of the relationship between Julie and Jane. Through Julie's invitation for Jane's input toward the summative evaluation process, Jane felt listened to and supported.

> I think the biggest thing is that she allows me to have input. There are no secrets, there is no hidden agenda I don't believe. I'm right there from the beginning, she has laid it out. This is what we're going to do. This is how we're going to do it, step by step (Teacher Jane, Juba).

Inga, at Indigo, felt that her relationship with the principal will remain the same. She made reference to the strength of Ivana's administrative skills and her willingness to solicit input from staff members. Ivana agreed that the relationship with her staff would not change at all. She credited this to an already laid foundation of teacher supervision practice. This was further complimented by Ivana being pivotal to opening Indigo five years ago.

Principal Roy saw one cf his roles as a star maker. The evaluation process at Oak Ridge facilitated the continuation of Roy being a "star maker"; therefore, he viewed the effect of his relationship with Roseanna to continue to be positive. In essence, it afforded him the opportunity to provide her with an affirmation of what she does well. He got to "star make."

> Being a star maker is giving credit where credit is due and making sure that people know when things are

> happening. A lot of folks do great things that aren't acknowledged and I think they need sometimes to know that at least you noticed, or sometimes it needs to be pointed out in the company of other people what this person has done, or isn't it wonderful . . . I think if we're ready to react if something goes wrong, we should be ready to react when something goes right (Principal Roy, Oak Ridge).

As her relationship with Roy had been positive, Roseanna anticipated it would remain so throughout the evaluation process. Roseanna's positive feelings toward Roy were expressed in her statement, "A people type of guy is what he is and I would wish that kind of principal for any teacher out there." This was a relationship built upon a history of affirmations.

In conclusion, all ten of the participants said the district policy created no change or difficulty in the principal-teacher relationship. The five teachers elaborated that their principals' role in evaluation was enhanced by the trusting, interpersonal relationships which were firmly established prior to the implementation of the district evaluation policy. How the principals built trust and kept it with staff members who were formally evaluated will be discussed in the next section.

Building Trust

When asked how does your principal build trust and keep it with those staff members like yourself who are being formally evaluated, all five mentioned the principals' involvement with potentially difficult or difficult parents. No other response earned such consistency.

Providing support with parents was not consistently identified as an indicator of building trust amongst the principals interviewed. Two of the administrators remarked on the importance of clear agendas as an integral ingredient in developing trust with those staff they were evaluating. Ivana and Julie spoke of teacher input, the importance of familiarity with the evaluation criteria, a well defined agenda and of no ulterior motives leaking their way into the process. Two teachers mirrored Ivana's response to the importance of clear agendas.

> Well, first of all, I don't think you can throw any curves at a teacher at any time during the process. I think that has to be established right off the bat. If you're going to surprise the teachers, say "Yes, you're working on these two goals sweetie, but I noticed that you haven't been out on supervision

> on time for the last three weeks," and that is a total surprise when a teacher has not been spoken to or encouraged to go out earlier or anything. I think there would be a trust level broken there. The other thing that I believe strongly in, is that you have to have a constant dialogue with your teachers about what your beliefs are and they know that I'm not wishy-washy; I say what I have to say and I approach things when I have to approach them or leave them when I have to leave them (Principal Ivana, Indigo).

Several of the teachers felt that the more "visible" the administrators were throughout the school and in their classrooms helped to build a deeper feeling of support and consequently, trust. Two of the teachers specifically commented on the value of informal pop in visits. This afforded the principals valuable opportunities to get a first hand look at the challenges their teachers faced in their classrooms. In turn, by having had this first hand look, the teachers felt the principals possessed a more realistic perspective when asked to deal with students behaving inappropriately. They could then relate to the child in the realm of his or her classroom context.

Providing support for difficult children was also seen as an example of how administrators nurtured trust in their relationships with their teachers. Inga, Jane and Roseanna spoke of the importance of the recognition they frequently received from their administrators. This was also identified as a trust builder.

> Yes . . . I get thank you cards. It's just being acknowledged. I think that's important. I'm noticing that you do do good things. Thank you I appreciate it. I'm glad you're on my staff (Teacher Jane, Juba).

Principals Julie, Roy and Kit felt recognition of individual efforts, either publicly or privately, was essential to the building of trust. In regards to Oak Ridge, this was mentioned in an earlier text describing Roy's "star maker" actions. Kit spoke of how imperative it was to be encouraging, especially with those experienced professionals, who have some discomfort with being formally observed.

> Whenever I see something that is positive, I try and give them feedback on that. I try to give them recognition in front of others. Isn't it great the way so and so did this? That was a great way you

> had of presenting that, or getting him involved, or your students really feel good being in this room, I can tell by these kinds of things. So you try and give them that kind of feedback through verbal, through written, through their involvement on other staff happenings, or programs, or committees, or whatever (Principal Kit, Keepsake).

In summary, principals built trust through their involvement with potentially difficult or difficult parents, through the establishment of clear agendas for evaluation purposes, through the involvement of staff in the evaluation process, and by ensuring that the teachers were clear on the evaluation criteria. Other examples were principal visibility throughout the school, informal pop in visits by the administrator and providing support with difficult children. Lastly, the recognition the teachers received from their direct supervisor, the principal, was also highlighted as to how trust was built and kept with the staff members being formally evaluated.

It is evident trust between the five pairs of educators at the five individual sites had been built both in part and separately to the implementation of the district policy. This was a pivotal factor in the positive acceptance of the summative evaluation conducted at these schools.

Value of Summative Evaluation

The five teachers were asked how the involvement in the summative evaluation process added to their repertoire of skills and to what extent. They were questioned as to whether the same could have been achieved without this formal participation. The possibility that something else may have professionally benefitted them more was also explored.

Confirmation of Teacher Skills

Four of the teachers felt that their involvement in the summative evaluation served primarily as a confirmation of the skills they already possessed. Where the teachers felt that they gained the most valuable insight was in the participation of the self-evaluation component offered to them as part of the evaluation process, at Indigo, Juba or Oak Ridge.

> If the self evaluation wasn't handed to me, I probably wouldn't have sat down to this extent to look at this. I know that it's valuable to sit down and self-evaluate and look at some constructive criticism or whatever, but again you have to make time for it. Unless you make time for it and

> actually actively seek out the time to do it, it probably wouldn't have gotten done. Not to this extent . . . I think if somebody took me into a corner and said, you're not going to have another meal until you sit down and churn something out, I probably wouldn't have done such a thorough one (Teacher Roseanna, Oak Ridge).

Harriet, in contrast, to the four other teachers felt her involvement in the first year of the implementation of the district policy had neither added to her repertoire of teaching skills or provided confirmation for already existing skills. Harriet suggested the process was directly linked to the principal as to its overall value.

> It's not followed through. I don't think it's so much the process as it is the person ... is only so good as the person who implements it (Teacher Harriet, Heartland).

There existed differences between Harriet and the four other teachers who felt that they benefitted from involvement in the summative evaluation process. The differences are two-fold. Firstly, Harriet was not directly involved as a participant in the development of the evaluation process at Heartland. A commercial teacher evaluation package was purchased by Principal Harold a year prior to the implementation of the district policy and it was Harold's intent to continue with it. Secondly, it is imperative to point out that, although the interview with Harriet took place eight months into the school year, none of the three agreed upon formal observations or the principal feedback aligned with these had occurred. Inga, Jane, Roseanna, and Kasandra's responses were grounded with more involvement, whether it be formal or informal, in the evaluation process.

Although Harriet may have not embraced the summative evaluation process as neither expanding or confirming of her teaching skills, she was generally positive in her overall view of the implementation of the district policy at the site.

In summary, Inga, Jane, Roseanna, and Kasandra believed there were benefits to their involvement in the evaluation process. The prime benefit was the confirmation of their status as competent teachers.

Supplementary Approaches to Summative Evaluation

The principal at Keepsake, Kit, had mentioned that evolving in her approach to summative evaluation would be the inclusion of an opportunity for peer coaching, peer reflection, and/or an opportunity for staff to put together a portfolio that demonstrated or displayed in some way their teaching, learning activities, or how they saw themselves as a professional. This remained in the developmental stage but Kasandra had begun to plant a seed for herself. Although Kasandra believed that a summative evaluation would benefit her the most, she suggested a teacher directed portfolio may also compliment the process. Earlier in the text, Kasandra had disclosed she had a low self concept. Perhaps this was one approach she felt could help her affirm her strengths. Jane, at Juba, also felt the addition of a teacher portfolio would not substitute the summative evaluation process; rather supplement it.

Harriet was the only teacher who felt that observing teachers throughout the district could have professionally benefitted her more than the summative evaluation. It was neither an option offered by Harold nor had Harriet requested it.

Of the five teachers, only one had suggested an alternative to summative evaluation. This was peer observation. Two others remained committed to the benefits of summative evaluation; however suggested a teacher portfolio as a compliment to the process. Those two remaining teachers had no comment. They were confident in their appraisal of the benefits of summative evaluation.

Summary

The five principals and five teachers perceived the passing of the district policy as being positive. Where the district policy was built upon accepted established practice, the transition toward the adoption of the new policy was relatively smooth. The principal was the key player in the implementation of the process.

The criteria was strongly influenced by the district policy. The socio-economic variables of the school community played a non-existent role in the evaluation process. Parent involvement toward the development of criteria did not occur nor was it invited.

The policy had neither created change nor difficulty in the relationship between the administrator and the teacher. The involvement of staff in the evaluation process was perceived as an additional technique in the building of trust between the evaluator and teacher.

A confirmation of existing teaching skills was perceived to be the result of teacher involvement in the summative evaluation process. Where this perception was absent was in direct relationship to the teacher's lack of involvement and participation in the evaluation process.

Peer supervision and the development of a teacher portfolio were viewed as possible supplementary approaches to summative evaluation.

CHAPTER 5

Discussion

The purpose of this discussion is to relate the findings to the literature review. Because of the interpretive nature of this study, additional literature, not reviewed in chapter 2, has been added to enrich the discussion in this chapter.

How the Evaluation Was Conducted at the School Site

The "key players" which critically influenced the evaluation process were the individuals who carried out the district policy and its actions; the principals and the teachers at the five school sites.

The effective adoption of a policy requires a process in which stakeholders can shape the policy to meet their own needs (Wise, Darling-Hammond, McLaughlin & Bernstein, 1985). Wise et al. recommended that, in order for teacher evaluation to be successful, the process in which teacher evaluation systems worked was matched to the district's fundamental operating assumptions. "A highly decentralized district should probably not use an evaluation process that stresses adherence to centrally determined goals and uniform curricular objectives" (Wise et al., 1985, p. 104).

In the large urban district in which the study took place, the school site was the key unit for educational improvement. Administrative responsibility of the goals and objectives had been decentralized to the school level. "Site based management suggests an evaluation model much more closely aligned to context than do other evaluation models" (O'Reilly, 1995, p. 8).

The district policy stated that staff members "should be encouraged to actively participate in planning, evaluating, and enhancing or improving their performance" (Staff Performance Handbook, 1995, 2.1.18). Teacher input was deemed as essential to the establishment of performance criteria, standards and goals. Principals were assigned the task of determining the degree of participation.

Participation was defined in the Staff Performance Handbook as:

> setting criteria, standards, and goals with mutually shared information in a climate of openness and appreciation for the knowledge and perspective that each person brings.

Participation was not:

1. Allowing staff to set criteria, standards and goals that were not aligned with district and decision unit goals, and that did not meet the policy and regulations for staff performance.

2. Listing the responsibilities/duties from the position description or role and responsibility statements (p. 2.1.18).

Staff participation is crucial to the success of the implementation of evaluation policy (Keller & Wall, 1986; Rymhs, Allston, & Schultz, 1993; Housego, 1989; Townsend, 1987; Gellman & Berkowitz, 1992; Lemmon, 1991; Haughey & Ratsoy, 1993). Effective implementation requires a process in which stakeholders can shape the policy to meet their own needs.

This flexibility for manipulation was a positive feature of the district policy. The participation at the school site was determined by the principal and it ranged from full participation of staff to no involvement. The principal became the most influential factor in the development of the evaluation process. Whether or not the principal embraced this flexibility as an opportunity to work toward school improvement through staff involvement was entirely his or her decision. This aligned itself to Fullan's (1982) research that not all principals are comfortable in the role as change agent.

Teacher perceptions of teacher evaluation have a bearing on their acceptance of it (McGreal, 1990). Teachers involved in the research of Haughey and Ratsoy (1993) in a report published by Alberta Education generally related their own experiences with their own evaluation processes as being fair. Teachers in general accepted that evaluation was necessary on the grounds of public accountability. This was also reflected in the statements shared by the personnel at Juba, Indigo, Heartland, Oak Ridge and Keepsake. The passing of the district policy was also perceived as being a positive avenue to enhance both principal and teacher accountability.

Wise et al. (1985) and Haughey and Ratsoy (1993) ascertained that teacher involvement and responsibility improve the quality of teacher evaluation. There was a relationship between the degree of involvement and satisfaction with the implementation of the district policy at the individual school sites. The more involved the teacher was the more positively they spoke of the process. This was also echoed in Townsend's work (1987) where he maintained that the heart of any effective evaluation policy was the collaborative relationship between the teacher and administrator. The input from both stakeholders effectively drive the process.

Strengths and Weaknesses

The principals, who were crucial to the success of the teacher evaluation process, expressed their concern over inadequate time and insufficient preparation for the implementation of the district policy. This was a recurrent theme in the literature on teacher evaluation (Wise et al., 1985; Townsend, 1987; Hildebrandt, 1986; Burger & Bumbarger, 1991; Haughey & Ratsoy, 1993). In addition, another difficulty was the potential for inconsistency across the district in implementing the district policy. However, Wise et al. (1985) argued that variability among policies is to be expected based on the reflection of the school district needs. This variability expanded itself even further at the individual school sites as a consequence of school site decision making.

Weaknesses of the evaluation processes conducted at the school site were identified by the teachers as including the: (a) gap between the three year evaluation cycle, (b) expertise and credibility of the evaluator, (c) potential for inconsistency across the district, and (d) lack of follow through at the school site. These difficulties were also highlighted in the Haughey and Ratsoy (1993) study where teachers voiced concerns for the need for the evaluator to be knowledgeable and current in those subjects they observed.

In the Townsend study (1984) of teacher evaluation practices in five southern Alberta secondary schools, similar weaknesses to those expressed by the teachers at Juba, Indigo, Heartland, Oak Ridge, and Keepsake were found. Similar responses were the lack of teacher confidence in the skill of the evaluator and administrative leadership with respect to evaluation was weak. Lack of follow through could also be interpreted as a consequence of the unreasonable time demands for supervisors to meet the demands of the policy (pp. 20-31). One of the recommendations made by Wise et al. (1985) toward the establishment of evaluation practices producing information that districts could use for helping teachers improve and/or make personnel decisions was: "the school district should regularly assess the quality of evaluation, including individual and collective evaluator competence" (p. 105). Presently, there is no such mechanism in place in the district.

What Influenced the Criteria Used in the Summative Process

District policy.

> A well designed, properly functioning teacher evaluation process provides a major communication link between the school system and teachers. On the one hand, it imparts concepts of teaching to teachers and frames the conditions of their work. On the other hand, it helps the school system structure, manage, and reward the work of teachers. (Wise et al., 1985, p. 61)

However, if one is not aware of the criteria reflected in the teacher evaluation process, the communication link is non-existent. In the Haughey and Ratsoy study (1993), the analysis of the jurisdictional policy documents revealed that 82% of jurisdictions specified evaluation criteria to be used in the teacher evaluation process. Some teachers were unaware of the jurisdictional criteria but were knowledgeable of the criteria used by their evaluators in assessing their teaching. There were others, however, who were unclear on what specific criteria was used by their supervisor to assess their teaching.

A similar situation presented itself among the five teachers involved at Juba, Indigo, Heartland, Oak Ridge, and Keepsake. The district policy with its specified evaluation criteria provided a durable skeleton on which the process and certainly the document could be developed upon. Of the five teachers, one was unaware of the criteria she was to be evaluated upon. This occurred at Heartland where there was no staff involvement in the implementation of the district policy and the final document came in the form of a commercially developed teacher evaluation package purchased by the administrator.

According to Gellman and Berkowitz (1992) successful evaluation procedures require agreement on the criteria of evaluation. In their review of the literature, Gellman and Berkowitz cite the work of Strike and Millman (1983), Kauchak, Peterson, and Driscoll (1985), and Selmes (1986) in the importance that evaluation criteria should be discussed and agreed upon between the teacher and the evaluator. The literature strongly affirms that teacher satisfaction with teacher evaluation systems is related to perceptions that all evaluators share the same criteria for evaluation and the teachers' ability to affect the criteria for evaluation (Wise et al., 1985, p. 70). Responses from the participants at the five school sites identified consistency across the district as to what criteria are being used to evaluate teachers and the opportunity for staff involvement to influence the process as strengths of the district policy. This also supported the Wise et al. (1985) findings.

Programming considerations. While it is acknowledged that there were unique differences among school cultures, the literature review did not identify local socio-economic factors as being important for the implementation of teacher evaluation policy. Although Wise et al. (1985) present a conceptual framework for the study of teacher evaluation in the context of school organizations, they did not specifically recognize sociological and environmental factors. Haughey and Ratsoy (1993) in their implications for action suggested that we should recognize that there are important differences in school cultures and that all schools should promote learning for all. There was no mention made of the demographic differences in school communities or possible considerations in the evaluation of teachers. This is certainly reflective of the available research on teacher evaluation.

It was curious, however, that nine of the participants could relate how the socio-economic variables of the community were instrumental in the delivery of programming at the five school sites; yet, these variables did not play a major role in developing a context for the evaluation. In Burger's (1988) work on teacher evaluation policy implementation, he also concurred that "the background literature review did not identify local socio-economic factors as being important to the implementation of teacher evaluation policy" (p. 183). Levin in his 1994 article on strategies for working with children from low income families suggested that "although poverty has powerful effects on educational outcomes, it receives relatively little attention in educational policies" (p. 23).

Wentzell (1991) identified certain requirements for successful teacher evaluation. His approach was unique as he recognized the diversity teachers face in their classrooms. Some have excellent resources, including parental support. Other teachers have the opposite. "Teachers recognize all too well that there is nothing more unequal than the equal evaluation of unequals" (p. 17). Wentzell had identified three essential requirements for successful teacher evaluation. These included: (a) the clear definition of the purposes of evaluation, (b) recognition of sociological and environmental constraints, and (c) sufficient time and resources. For the second requirement, he listed some of the sociological and environmental constraints to include student competency, level of home support, range of student abilities within a class, resources available to the teacher, and community expectations concerning the outcomes of education (p. 18). Wentzell maintained that any teacher evaluation scheme which neglected this particular context was not valid.

The recognition of sociological and environmental constraints naturally lends itself to school based management where decisions concerning the delivery of educational services for students are made at the school level. This is further illustrated by O'Reilly (1995) who stated, "Site based management suggests an evaluation model much more closely allied to results and context than do other evaluation models" (p. 8).

In this study, the participants were cognizant of the impact socio-economic influences played on the delivery of programming. Teachers were expected to make curriculum decisions which best met the needs of their students. The challenges ranged from programming for children functioning two to three years below grade level to those exceeding academic expectations. Some came to school hungry. Some children came to school with life experiences which involved travel and involvement in supervised educational and recreational activities outside of the school. Parent involvement and expectations ranged from extreme to none. This formed the context in which the teacher did her job. Yet this context was visibly absent from the evaluation process.

Of the five schools involved, only one was working towards the development of a teacher and school profile unique to the school site. However, at the time the data were collected for this study, the profiles remained undeveloped.

Parent involvement. The school site, within the school based management framework, is the key unit for educational improvement. This involves a variety of partners; parents, members of the school council, teachers, support and custodial staff, students, community agencies, and most recently business partnerships. These partners are instrumental in the establishment of yearly school goals, the plan of how to achieve the goals and indicators of success. Such collaboration is a feature at all the five school sites.

The school based management model empowered the local community with decision making and encouraged input from those responsible for implementing decisions. Parents were provided with opportunities primarily in the areas of budget, the hiring of personnel and programming priorities. Parent involvement was purposefully solicited in the development of the annual school plan required by each school for submission to the school board. Parents were surveyed, meetings were held and involvement included the parent council and beyond. Each school, except Heartland, had a parent council in place from which to solicit input from. The degree of parent involvement at each of the five school sites ranged from minimal to over one hundred stakeholders.

Opportunities for parents to have input into the evaluation criteria had neither been explored or offered by either the administrators or the teachers at Juba, Indigo, Heartland, Oak Ridge, or Keepsake. Furthermore, it had not been suggested by the parent council at any of the four school sites.

The influence of parents on the evaluation process, of all the items discussed during the ten interviews, remained the most contentious. There exists a certain irony with the overall resistance of parental involvement in the evaluation process. Every two years randomly selected parents from each school community were asked to express their opinion in a district attitude survey. Questions which ask the parent to make evaluative judgements on their child's teacher(s) include:

> How satisfied are you
>
> 1. With the programs (courses) available at your child's school?
> 2. That your child receives the help needed to succeed in school?

3. With the emphasis placed on the reading; writing; mathematics; science; social studies program(s) at your child's school?
4. With the way computer technology is used in your school?
5. That you receive enough information about what your child is expected to learn; is expected to behave; about how your child is progressing?
6. With the way discipline is handled in your child's classroom?
7. With your child's teacher(s)?

These results are shared with the staff and community and are made available to the larger community upon request. Although the influence on parents has not been directly encased in the evaluation process, their evaluative input is certainly represented on the district survey. It appears that the results were attached to the "whole," not the individual. This, in itself, lowers the individual teacher's accountability and consequently, level of concern. It is interesting to note that during the gathering of the data for this study, only Principal Harold from Heartland made reference to the Heartland parent attitude survey results. This could be interpreted to show the extent to which these results are taken.

The literature available on parent involvement in teacher evaluation is minimal. However, there are sprinklings of its future potential in the research pertaining to charter schools. There was one local study, however, whose results have implications for future consideration.

A three year Alberta based study conducted by Rymhs, Allston and Schultz (1993) in the Spirit River School Division asked teachers, students, and parents for their involvement in the "development of a set of indicators that could be used to assess teacher effectiveness in formative and summative processes" (p. 191). Surveys were distributed to parents of students in grades 2, 5, 8, and 11. The intent of these surveys was to gain parent (and student input) into the criteria established by teachers and finalized by a teacher committee. The parental survey results indicated agreement for the criteria which was being used to judge teacher performance. Highest priorities for parents were: "(1) a safe and productive environment, (2) attention to individual learning needs, (3) clarity of objectives, (4) the teacher being an active listener, and (5) the pupil-teacher relationship" (p. 199). The authors outlined three benefits of the parent, student, and teacher collaborative approach. They were the development of an "appropriate response mechanism" to allow teachers, principals, and parents to identify at-risk learning situations, greater local ownership for professional growth and development opportunities, and the use of the same criteria for both summative and formative evaluations had heightened teachers' awareness regarding professional expectations (pp. 201-202). It is essential, however, to stress that the parental input was in the developmental process; not from the back of a classroom with a checklist of teacher actions.

In 1993, at an elementary school in Colorado, parent observations in classrooms became an important part of an overall plan, not for teacher evaluation, but for a school improvement goal to improve student self esteem (Meadows, 1993, pp. 31-34). The primary focus of the classroom observations was on student behavior. Two parents, the principal, and two teachers developed an observation outline and detailed operating agreements for the observations. Initially the teacher's responses to these classroom observations were ones of apprehension. "Teachers felt as parents might if several teachers at their school wanted to make a home visit to assess their parenting skills" (p. 32). However, with an agreed upon timeline and information sharing sessions to dispel incorrect perceptions, the classroom observations began.

The observed student behaviors were compared to the school's list of beliefs about self esteem. As a result of the Colorado project, several positive results were noted: (a) teachers had information about their own classrooms to promote enhanced self reflection, (b) closer relationships developed between parents and staff, (c) parents gained a better understanding of how current educational practices affect student learning; (d) a clearer understanding of what student behaviors indicating self esteem occurred most and least frequently, (e) a clearer picture of what self esteem practices should be continued at the school, and (f) what should be improved (p. 34).

Neither study had direct impact on the summative evaluation of a particular teacher or teachers. Perhaps this accounts for the success of both studies and the openness of the staffs to welcome this involvement.

Effect of Evaluation on Principal and Teacher Relationship

Eight of the participants said that the policy had created no change or difficulty in the principal-teacher relationship. The remaining two participants felt it actually strengthened their relationships.

A theme throughout the literature was the importance of trust between the principal and the teacher in successful teacher evaluation process. "The personal and professional relationships that each of the leaders had established with their teachers were important facets of this nurturing . . . and common among them was their teachers liked and trusted them" (Maynes et al., 1995, p. 11). McGreal (1983) stressed that the most effective evaluation system is the quality of what occurs at the bottom of the system -- the relationship that exists between the supervisor and the teacher when they meet one to one. Teacher evaluation involves the relationship of two people both of whom must share a willingness to participate in and understand the process. Without this, there is little chance of success (Haughey & Ratsoy, 1993). This is a recurrent item in the literature on teacher evaluation.

The creation of principal-teacher relationships such as the ones established at Juba, Indigo, Heartland, Oak Ridge, and Keepsake did not happen overnight. With the exception of Julie and Jane at Juba, the other four relationships had a history of a minimum of three years at the same school site. This was Jane's first year with Julie and the direct involvement she had in the implementation of the district evaluation policy at the school site became a stepping stone to the building of her professional relationship with Principal Julie.

The trust between the five pairs of educators had been built both in part and separately to the implementation of the district policy. It was what happened outside and inside the teacher's classroom door throughout the year day in, day out that influenced these relationships. Principals' actions with difficult parents, their visibility throughout the school, provision of support with difficult students and recognition given to teachers for their efforts were powerful relationship builders. Principal actions attached to the evaluation process in building relationships were the opportunity for staff involvement, the communication of clear agendas and purposes for the evaluation process, and the checking for teacher understanding of the required criteria. Teacher evaluation certainly has the potential to be a powerful communication link between the teacher and the principal. It was through this feedback that two of the participants felt their relationships were strengthened.

As the literature suggested and the findings of this study confirmed, the inter-personal communication skills required by the principal for effective evaluation purposes cannot be underestimated.

Value of Summative Evaluation

The literature on evaluation (Clarke, 1995, Foret & Hickey, 1987, Gellman & Berkowitz, 1992, Hickcox, E., 1990, Housego, 1989, Haughey & Ratsoy, 1993, Leithwood & Fullan, 1984, Wise et al., 1985) suggested that the formal evaluation process seldom results in meaningful changes in teacher behavior. In this study, the same finding emerged. Four of the teachers felt that their involvement in the summative evaluation served primarily as a confirmation of the skills they already possessed. This was not going to result in meaningful change in their teacher behavior. Their involvement in the process was essentially a confirmation of the status quo. In the work of Haughey and Ratsoy (1993), the most common benefit of teacher evaluation was identified by the teachers as the "pat on the back." It was a confirmation that their services were valued. This similar theme has emerged with this study.

Alternative approaches suggested by three of the participants were identified as teacher portfolio assessment and peer observation. However, two of these participants felt that the teacher portfolio would supplement the summative evaluation. Both felt that the summative evaluation process at their school remain as is. Only one participant, Harriet, wanted to replace the summative evaluation process with peer supervision. Of the five teachers, she had the most minimum involvement with the implementation of the district policy at the school site.

Both teacher portfolio assessment and peer observation have excellent potential for the professional growth of teachers. Furthermore, both approaches could provide valuable information moving toward a deeper recognition of what Wentzell (1991) referred to as sociological and environmental constraints. It gives deeper meaning to the context in which the teacher performs his or her duties.

Through teachers' involvement in the design and development of the evaluation practice and the opportunities to experiment with alternative approaches, such as peer observation and teacher portfolios, it will better reflect in the simplest of terms, what "they" are doing. It is what Fullan refers to as giving voice to the teacher's purpose (1991). By listening to that voice will evaluation become more meaningful and beneficial for all major stakeholders.

The flexibility of the district policy lends itself to the incorporation of supplementary approaches to summative evaluation. By providing opportunities to give voice to teachers' purposes, the closer we move towards successful teacher evaluation.

CHAPTER 6

Conclusions, Recommendations, and Personal Reflections

This chapter contains three sections. The first section summarizes the major conclusions. The second section suggests recommendations for future summative evaluation processes. The third section briefly addresses personal reflections gleaned from participation in the research.

Conclusions

How the Evaluation Was Conducted at the School Site

General perceptions. The five principals and five teachers perceived the passing of the district policy as being positive. Principals responded positively to the reduced work load, the responsibility to ensure that all teachers throughout the district were being evaluated on a three year cycle, and that the information to be placed on the teachers' personnel files would be useful for staffing decisions. The teachers' positive responses were more central to the evaluation document being useful for the purpose of securing another teaching position within the district. Agreement between the administrators and teachers existed within the general perception that the required criteria identified in the policy would facilitate consistency across the district. Furthermore, the process to include the required criteria would increase the accountability of both the principal and the teacher.

Principal preparation for the process. There was general dissatisfaction shared by the administrators in regards to the contents of the Staff Performance Handbook and the inservices to support the handbook. Criticism was directed toward the late arrival of the handbook, the quality of the inservice education, and the lack of credibility of the presenters.

Who was involved? There was a relationship between the degree of involvement and satisfaction with the implementation of the district policy at the individual school site. The more the process was shaped by the individuals directly involved in the summative evaluation, the more positive these staff members' responses were. Where the district policy was built upon accepted established practice, the transition toward the adoption of the new policy was relatively smooth. This was complemented further by the fact that the five administrators had been assigned to their schools for a minimum of three years or more. This was integral to the establishment and continuity of evaluation procedures on which the new policy was built. The major difference perceived by the respondents was that no longer would placing the final document in the teacher's personnel file be up to the discretion of either the principal or teacher.

Processes for staff involvement included direct involvement of the major stakeholders, informal teacher input blended with the principals' general guidelines for performance planning and evaluation, or no staff involvement.

Strengths and weaknesses. Strengths identified by the five teachers were: (a) the involvement of staff, (b) the self evaluation component, (c) principals being held more accountable in working with teachers experiencing difficulty, (d) increased teacher accountability, (e) flexibility of the policy, (f) positive reaffirmation of existing practice, and (g) feedback from the administrator.

Strengths discussed by the five administrators were: (a) staff involvement, (b) increased teacher and principal accountability, (c) the potential to build upon previously built foundations at the school sites, (d) reduction of the work load, (e) a move towards consistency of criteria across the district, and (f) an effective way to promote communication with teachers.

Weaknesses identified by the five teachers included: (a) the large gap between evaluation cycles, (b) lack of evaluator expertise and credibility, (c) potential inconsistency across the district in evaluation documents, and (d) lack of follow through at the school site.

Weaknesses identified by the five administrators were: (a) lack of time, (b) potential for inconsistency across the district in formatting, and (c) the process being more principal driven than teacher driven.

What influenced the criteria used in the summative process? The district policy played a pivotal role in the establishment of criteria used in the summative process. It provided the skeleton for the format. The socio-economic variables of the school community, although vital considerations in the delivery of programming, played a non-existent role in the evaluation process. Opportunities for parents to have input into the criteria had neither been explored nor offered by either the administrator or the teacher. Furthermore, it had not been suggested by the parent council at any of the four school sites that parents have this degree of involvement. Heartland did not have a parent council in place.

Effect of Evaluation on Principal and Teacher Relationship

All ten of the participants felt that the policy had created neither change nor difficulty in the principal-teacher relationship. Four of the five partnerships had a vested history of over three years. Second, the impact of previous teacher evaluation practice played a role in influencing the relationship between the principal and the teacher. As the previous practice for teacher evaluation shared several similarities with the new district policy, the transition was relatively smooth. As a consequence, the principal-teacher relationship was not affected.

Building trust. A consistent answer among the five teachers, with regards as to how their principals built trust and kept it with staff members who were being formally evaluated, revolved around the individuals principal's involvement with potentially difficult or difficult parents. Other examples included: (a) the establishment of clear agendas for evaluation purposes, (b) staff involvement in the evaluation process, (c) clearly established evaluation criteria, (d) principal visibility throughout the school and classrooms, (e) support with difficult children, and (f) recognition of teacher efforts. Building trust did not begin with the establishment of the district policy. It began the first day teachers were assigned to their classrooms. The involvement of staff in the evaluation process was simply another tool used by principals to build trust with their teachers. Trust building was an ongoing process.

Value of Summative Evaluation

Four of the teachers felt that their involvement in the summative evaluation served primarily as a confirmation of the skills they already possessed. Where the teachers felt that they gained the most valuable insight was in the participation of the self evaluation component offered to them as part of the evaluation process. Where the value of summative evaluation was not embraced as either adding to ones' repertoire of teaching skills or confirming already existing skills, this was in direct relationship to the teacher's lack of involvement and participation in the process.

Supplementary Approaches to Summative Evaluation.

Of the five teachers, only one had suggested an alternative to summative evaluation. This was peer supervision. In addition, two others felt that the teacher portfolio, as an addition, to the summative evaluation would be beneficial.

Recommendations

Twelve recommendations for practice emerge from the conclusions drawn in this study. It is recommended that:

1. Principals should continue to receive leadership development on a variety of evaluation procedures. The principals should receive training from other administrators with evaluation expertise. Opportunities for principals to view and discuss exemplary school site based practices should be a standard requirement of the inservice program.

2. Principals should be provided with professional growth opportunities to expand their repertoire of inter-personal communication skills. The inter-personal communication skills required by the principal for effective evaluation purposes cannot be underestimated.

3. Principals should be provided with assistance in the actual writing of the evaluation document. Not all administrators come equipped with strong writing skills.

These writing skills play an important role in the execution of the final stages of the evaluation process.

A pool of administrators with both evaluation expertise and excellent writing skills could be established. Another possibility could be the involvement of high school English teachers in developing and presenting writing workshops for administrators. This list would be made available to principals should they require this assistance.

4. The evaluation process should involve all major stakeholders and be continuous throughout the year. Teachers, administrators, students, and parents should be provided with opportunities in the development and validation of criteria that can be used in the evaluation process. It is imperative that teachers play the largest role in this collaborative effort. The required criteria already established by the district policy provides a sturdy foundation from which to build from. It is within this collaborative approach that the sociological and environmental constraints of the school community could be recognized. These constraints are pivotal to making the evaluation increasingly meaningful for the teacher.

5. School and classroom profiles should be developed at each school. The school profile would include

demographic information, student competency upon entering the school, level of home support, and community expectations concerning the outcomes of education. Further challenges that the school faces on a daily basis should also be included.

The classroom profile, submitted by the classroom teacher, would include the total number of students, the range of student abilities, student behavioral concerns, family issues, and resources available to meet these daily challenges.

This school and classroom profile could be attached to the evaluation document. This would be beneficial in the recognition of the social and environmental constraints the teacher faces.

6. Timetables should be adjusted to provide release time for teachers receiving summative evaluations to meet with each other and the administrator to engage in discussions on the purpose of the evaluation, the established criteria and procedures to be used. Ensuring that teachers have a clear understanding of the evaluation criteria is essential to successful practice. Furthermore, this dialogue will undoubtedly lead to discussion about teaching and learning. This needs to be revisited throughout the year.

7. Self evaluation should become a component of the evaluation process. This structured process of reflection will allow staff to assess their own skill development and performance. This will give teachers a greater sense of control over the evaluation practice.

8. With the decreased number of staff requiring summative evaluation on the three year cycle, the administrator should make a firm commitment to evaluation being a top priority. Classrooms should be visited frequently and informally. Principal visibility throughout the school is essential to him or her gaining information about the context in which teaching and learning take place. By following though on this priority, a clear message is communicated: teacher evaluation at this school is important.

9. Collegial methods of evaluation should be implemented during the gap between the three year summative evaluation cycle. This should be teacher driven and time provided for teachers to meet and provide informal assistance to each other. Administrative support should be in the form of resources: time for teachers to meet and class coverage either by the principal or supply teachers. Alternative methods should be decided collegially and could involve various forms of

portfolio assessment and/or peer observation. At the end of the school year, it would be an expectation that teachers share their learning with the administrator in a scheduled "one-on-one" debriefing meeting.

10. Administrators should recognize, either publicly or privately, the challenges each classroom teacher faces. This recognition is essential to building trust, not only for evaluation practices but for the establishment of healthy collaborative school settings. In order to recognize these challenges, it is imperative that the principal visit classrooms frequently, be visible throughout the school, and fully understand the dynamics of the entire school community.

11. A review of the district policy should be conducted annually by a group of stakeholders. The same process should be conducted at the school site. It is essential that the process continues to serve the purposes it was intended to meet. Should the purposes change, so must the processes change.

12. Future implementation of a new district teacher evaluation policy should be given sufficient time and resources to promote greater clarity and understanding of its requirements. One possible strategy would be a one

year pilot with volunteer involvement in at least 25% of the schools in the district. This involvement should be revisited throughout the year resulting in possible changes or amendments as generated from the input of the administrators and teachers.

The "year" pilot would provide for a sufficient time frame for the remaining school personnel to get oriented toward the implementation of the policy resulting in greater clarity of its purpose and its expectations. Principals, therefore, may feel more prepared for this enormous undertaking.

Recommendations for Further Research

Research suggests that effective teaching behaviors vary for students of different socio-economic, mental and psychological characteristics (Wise et al., 1985, p. 67). To what extent do these teaching behaviors vary and how does this alter the community expectations concerning educational outcomes? This would help us, as educators, gain a greater context in how teachers program to accommodate a range of both student differences and differing community expectations.

Another consideration for further research would be the examination of teachers who excel either in providing instruction in high socio-economic communities or low income communities. Are there specific characteristics that underline their abilities to meet the specific challenges generated from both contexts? If so, how do we evaluate these?

It is also recommended that further study be conducted on effective local evaluation practices that involve all the major stakeholders in site-based decision making settings. Special attention to the role of parents in the process would be beneficial.

Personal Reflections

Improving teachers and schools are the keys to improving students. One cannot benefit without the other. Neither can these major stakeholders exist in isolation without the influence of the outside community and its expectations concerning the outcomes of education.

It is time to give purpose to the teachers' voice. In giving purpose to this voice it is imperative we hear the context from which it speaks. Otherwise, it continues to be a whisper in the dark. It is when we can hear an entire chorus that teacher evaluation becomes a process to get teachers working together, a process to increase accountability of all stakeholders, and a process to promote life long learning.

REFERENCES

Ackland, R. (1991). A review of the peer coaching literature. Journal of Staff Development. 12 (1), 22-27.

Alberta Education (1984). Program policy manual (2nd ed.) Edmonton.

Alberta Education (1993). Toward teacher growth: A study of the impact of Alberta's teacher evaluation policy. Edmonton.

Alberta Education (1994). Three year business plan. Edmonton.

Barth, R. S. (1990). Improving schools from within: Teachers, parents and principals can make the difference. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bennett, C. K. (1991). Staff development in light of Maslow's theory. Journal of Staff Development. 12 (4), 10-14.

Berg, B. (1995). Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences (2nd ed.). MA: Alynn & Bacon, Inc.

Bosetti, L. (1996). Teacher evaluation as pedagogic opportunity: A case for portfolio assessment. The Canadian Administrator. 35, (8), 1-11.

Burger, J. M. (1988). Teacher evaluation policy implementation. Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta.

Burger, J. M. & Bumbarger, C. S. (1991). Teacher evaluation in school systems: An analysis of local policies. The Canadian Administrator, 30 (5), 1-7.

Caldwell, B. J. & Sprinks, J. M. (1992). Leading the self-managing school. London: Falmer Press.

Campo, C. (1993). Collaborative school cultures: How principals make a difference. School Organization, 13 (2), 119-127.

City of Edmonton, Planning Department (1993). Socio-economic and land use system residency report.

Clarke. B. V. (1995). Teacher evaluation policy: Impact study. The Canadian School Executive. 14 (7), 8-13.

Cox, C. L., Gabry, M. M., & Johnson, L. (1991). Peer coaching: A process for developing professionalism, achieving instructional excellence, and improving student learning. Site-Based Management and Teacher Empowerment. 17 (4), 23-26.

da Costa, J. (1995). Teacher collaboration: The roles of trust and respect, a paper prepared for presentation at the 1995 American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, April 18-22, 1995.

DeRoche, E. F. (1987). An administrator's guide for evaluating programs and personnel: An effective school program. Massachusetts: Allyn & Bacon, Inc.

Duncan, A. N. (1984). Teacher evaluation practices in Alberta. Edmonton, Alberta: Planning Services, Alberta Education.

Edmonton Public Schools (1995). Staff performance handbook, a toolkit of guidelines·processes·samples.

Elmore, R. F. (1978). Organizational models of social program implementation. Public Policy, 26 (2), 185-228.

Fegyverneki, J. (1990). Perceived effects of teacher performance evaluation in the County of Lac Ste. Anne No. 28. Unpublished master's project, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta.

Foret, R. & Hickey, P. (1987). The evaluation of teachers in the Fort McMurray Catholic School District. Unpublished master's project, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta.

Fullan, M. G. (1982). The meaning of educational change. Toronto: OISE.

Fullan, M. G. (1993). Change forces probing the depths of educational reform. London: Falmer Press.

Fullan, M. G. & Hargeaves, A. (1991). What's worth fighting for? Working together for your school. Toronto: Ontario Teachers Federation.

Gellman, G. & Berkowitz, C. (1992). Factors perceived as important in teacher evaluation. The Alberta Journal of Educational Research. 38 (3), 219-234.

Gogowich, G. M. (1992). The principal's role in education. Unpublished master's project, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta.

Harte, A. & Dibbon, D. (1992). Students rating teachers: How teachers react. The Canadian School Executive. 12 (5) 8-13.

Haughey, M. & Ratsoy, E. (1993). Toward teacher growth: A study of the impact of Alberta's teacher education policy. Alberta Education. Edmonton.

Hickcox, E. S. (1982). Dilemmas in teacher evaluation. Canadian Teachers Federation, Ottawa.

Hickcox, E. S. (1990). Ideas for performance appraisal: Breaking the mold. The Canadian School Executive. 10 (3) 11-13.

Hickcox, E. S., Lawton, S., Leithwood, K., & Musella, D. (1988). Making a difference through performance appraisal. Toronto: OISE.

Hildebrandt, L. B. (1986). Attitudes of principals to policies, procedures and guidelines for the formal evaluation of teachers. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta.

Hofengardner, J. D. & Walker, R. (1994). Collegial support: An alternative to principal led supervision of instruction. National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin. 68, 35-40.

Holly, P. & Southworth, G. (1989). The developing school. London: Falmer Press.

Housego, I. E. (1989). Principals' evaluation of teachers in a British Columbia school district: Are the reports professional or bureaucratic documents? The Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 20 (3), 196-216.

Kauchak, D., Peterson, K., & Driscoll, A. (1985). An interview study of teachers' attitudes toward teacher evaluation practices. Journal of Research and Development in Education. 19 (1), 32-37.

Keeler, B. T. & Wall, D. (1987). Teachers want better evaluation. ATA Magazine. 67 (2), 13-15.

Knight, D. (1992). A response to collaborative decision making: Empowering teachers. The Canadian Administrator. 32 (2), 7-9.

Krupp, J. A. (1991). Adult development, implications for staff development. Project RISE, Colchester, CT.

Krupp, J. A. (1991a). Adult development workshop. Williamsburg, Virginia.

Krupp, J. A. (1991b). Beyond the 3 R's: Focusing on quality of life. Journal of Staff Development. 12 (4), 20-23.

Kuzsman, F. J. & Horte, A. (1986). Teacher supervision and classroom improvement. The Education Digest. 51 (2), 30-31.

Leithwood, K. & Fullan, M. (1984). Fostering long-term growth in school system effectiveness. The Canadian Administrator. 24 (3), 6-13.

Lemmon, P. (1991). Teacher evaluation. Education Canada. Fall, 34-38.

Levin, B. (1982). Teacher evaluation: Lessons learned. The Canadian School Executive. 1 (10), 5-8.

Levin, B. (1994). Strategies for working with children from low income families. The Canadian School Executive. 14 (2), 23-25.

Lovell, J. T. & Wiles, K. (1983). Supervision for better schools (5th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Maynes, B., Knight, D., McIntosh, G., & Umpleby, S. (1995). Lessons from exemplary practices of teacher evaluation. The Canadian Administrator. 34 (7), 1-12.

McGreal, T. L. (1990). The use of rating scales in teacher evaluation: Concerns and recommendations. Journal of Personnel Management. 32 (1), 41-58.

Meadows, B. J. (1993). Through the eyes of parents. Educational Leadership. 51 (2), 31-34.

Mireau, L. (1985). Evaluating and improving teaching performance: Inservice kit. Edmonton, Alberta: Planning Services, Alberta Education.

Mireau, L. (1986). Recognizing and developing effective teaching practices. The Canadian School Executive. 6 (5), 13-15.

O'Reilly, R. R. (1995). Personnel evaluation in the site-based managed school. Challenge in Educational Administration. 32 (2), 8-11.

Olivero, J. & Heck, J. (1993). Staff evaluation: The Fort McMurray plan. Education Canada, 33 (2), 4-9.

Pearce-Burrows, A. (1994). Clinical supervision - myth or reality? Challenges in Educational Administration. 31 (1), 32-36.

Reikie, M. J. (1977). Policies and practices used in preparing formal evaluations of teachers in Alberta. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta.

Ripley, D. & Hart, C. (1989). Action research in teacher evaluation. The Canadian School Executive. 9 (5), 12-15.

Royle, J. (1993). Strengthening school culture. The Canadian School Executive. 12 (5), 20-21.

Rymhs, R., Allston, D., & Schultz, L. (1993). Effective teaching does make a difference. The Alberta Journal of Educational Research. 19 (2), 191-203.

Selmes, A. (1986). Teacher evaluation in the classroom. Educational Management and Administration. 14, 191-196.

Sergiovanni, T.J. (1995). The principalship: A reflective practice perspective (3rd ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Simon & Shuster.

Shantz, D. (1993). Collaborative leadership and female administration: A perfect partnership for the future. The Canadian School Executive. 13 (2), 3-5.

Singh, R. (1984). Peer evaluation: A process that could enhance the self-esteem and professional growth of teachers. Education. 105 (1), 73-75.

Sparks, D. (1991). Honoring the individual within staff development: An interview with Judy-Arin Kru Journal of Staff Development. 12 (4), 2-5.

Strike, K. & Millmar, J. (1983). Nontechnical questions about teacher evaluation systems in elementary and secondary schools: A research agenda. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis. 5, 389-397.

Townsend, D. (1984). Teaher evaluation in secondary schools. Edmonton, Alberta: Planning Services: Alberta Education.

Townsend, D. (1987). Components of a model of teacher evaluation. Education Canada. 27 (4), 24-43.

Townsend, D. & Omotari, L. (1990). Teacher supervision and evaluation project. Education Canada. 30 (4), 18-22.

Tuckman, B. W. (1995). Assessing effective teaching. Peabody Journal of Education. 70 (2), 127-138.

Turner, R. R. (1986). Teachers speak out about their evaluations. Learning. 15 (2), 58-67.

Valencia, S. & Killion, J. (1988). Overcoming obstacles to teacher change: Direction from school-based efforts. Journal of Staff Development. 9 (2), 168-174.

Valancia, S. McGinley, W., & Pearson, P. D. (1990). Assessing reading and writing: Building a more complete picture. Reading in the middle school. Newark: International Reading Association.

Walen, E. & DeRose, M. (1993). The power of peer appraisals. Educational Leadership. 51 (2), 45-48.

Wentzell, R. C. (1991). Teacher evaluation: A symphony misconducted. The Canadian School Executive. 11, (3), 17-19.

Wise, A. E., Darling-Hammond, L., McLaughlin, M. W., & Bernstein, H. T. (1985). Teacher evaluation: A study of effective practices. Elementary School Journal. 86 (1), 60-121.

Wolf, K. (1991). The school teacher's portfolio. Phi Delta Kappau. 73 (3), 129-136.

Wolf, K. (1996). Developing an effective teaching portfolio. Educational Leadership. 53 (6), 34-37.

Wolf, K., Whinez, B., & Hagerty, P. (1995). Teaching portfolios and portfolio conversations for teacher educators and teachers. The Journal of the Association of Teacher Educators. 17 (1), 30-39.

APPENDIX A

ADMINISTRATOR INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

ADMINISTRATOR INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Opener

1. Something "gleaned" from the previous observation: i.e., I notice the variety of student art projects displayed throughout the school. Is art taught as a separate subject or is it integrated across the curriculum?

2. Definition of terms: i.e., The purposes for evaluation are generally divided into two major areas: evaluation for making personnel decisions (summative) and evaluation for professional development purposes (formative). Formative evaluation is concerned with "doing" and summative evaluation is concerned with "what was done." For the purpose of this research, the emphasis will be on the summative; the evaluation used for making personnel decisions.

Cluster One

How the Evaluation is Conducted at the Individual School Site

1. Locally, effective June 1, 1995, board policy adopted by Edmonton Public Schools established a requirement that a written evaluation be completed for every staff member at

least once every three years and it be placed on the staff member's personnel file. Would you share with me your general thoughts on the implementation of this policy?

2. How has this influenced the manner in which you conduct the formal summative evaluation process at your school?

3. What's your process at this school to meet this district requirement?

4. What do you believe are the strengths of the process you implement at your school site?

5. What do you believe are the weaknesses of the process you implement at your school site?

Cluster Two

What Influences the Criteria Used in the Summative Process?

1. What criteria are involved in your process?

2. What can you tell me about your school community? What impact does this have on the delivery of programming?

3. Do you consider the make-up of your community a part of the

criteria in the evaluation of your staff? If so, how is this reflected in the document you place on the staff member's personnel file? If not, do you think the make-up of the community should be a consideration in the evaluation of teachers at school based decision making sites?

4. Do you provide parents with the opportunity to have input into the criteria to evaluate teachers? If not, would you provide parents with this opportunity for input?

Cluster Three

What Effect the Evaluation Process Has on the Relationship Between Principals and Teachers?

1. What do you view as the probable effect of the summative evaluation on your relationship with the staff involved? Why do you think this?

2. In preparation for this interview, I did a fair amount of reading on the formal evaluation process. One of the main characteristics of the research speaks about the establishment of trust between principal and teacher. How do you build trust and keep it with the teacher you're formally evaluating?

APPENDIX B

TEACHER INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

TEACHER INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Opener

1. Something "gleaned" from the previous observation: i.e., I notice the variety of student art projects displayed throughout the school. Is art taught as a separate subject or is it integrated across the curriculum?

2. Definition of terms: i.e., The purposes for evaluation are generally divided into two major areas: evaluation for making personnel decisions (summative) and evaluation for professional development purposes (formative). Formative evaluation is concerned with "doing" and summative evaluation is concerned with "what was done." For the purpose of this research, the emphasis will be on the summative; the evaluation used for making personnel decisions.

Cluster One

How the Evaluation is Conducted at the Individual School Site

1. Locally, effective June 1, 1995, board policy adopted by Edmonton Public Schools established a requirement that a written evaluation be completed for every staff member at

least once every three years and it be placed on the staff member's personnel file. Would you share with me your general thoughts on the implementation of this policy?

2. How has this influenced the manner in which the formal summative evaluation is conducted at your school?

3. What is the process at this school to meet this district requirement?

4. What do you believe are the strengths of the process implemented at your school site?

5. What do you believe are the weaknesses of the process implemented at your school site?

Cluster Two

What Influences the Criteria Used in the Summative Process?

1. What criteria are involved in the evaluation process?

2. What can you tell me about your school community? What impact does this have on the delivery of programming?

3. Has the make-up of your community been considered a part of

the criteria in the evaluation of staff? If so, how is this reflected in the document placed on your personnel file? If not, do you think the make-up of the community should be a consideration in the evaluation of teachers in school based decision making sites?

4. Are parents provided with the opportunity to have input into the criteria to evaluate teachers? If not, do you think parents should be provided with this opportunity for input?

Cluster Three

What Effect the Evaluation Process Has on the Relationship Between Principals and Teachers?

1. What do you view the probable effect of the summative evaluation on your relationship with your principal? Why do you think this?

2. In preparation for this interview, I did a fair amount of reading on the formal evaluation process. One of the main characteristics of the research speaks about the establishment of trust between principal and teacher. How does your principal build trust and keep it with staff members, like yourself, who are being formally evaluated?

Cluster Four

The Certified Teacher's View as to Whether the Results of the Summative Evaluation is Valuable to Adding to His/Her Repertoire of Skills and to What Extent?

1. Tell me about your teaching career . . . how long have you been teaching? . . . where? . . . what? . . . any time in between? . . .

2. How has the involvement in the summative evaluation process added to your repertoire of skills and to what extent?

3. Could the same have been achieved without this formal participation? How?

4. Is there anything else that may have professionally benefitted you more?